COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY,

joint with the

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

WASHINGTON, D.C.

DEPOSITION OF: ROBERT HUNTER BIDEN

Wednesday, February 28, 2024

Washington, D.C.

The deposition in the above matter was held in room 6220, O'Neill House Office Building, commencing at 10:00 a.m.

Present from the Committee on Oversight and Accountability: Representatives Comer, Jordan, Foxx, Grothman, Higgins, Biggs, Mace, Fallon, Donalds, Timmons, Greene, Boebert, Fry, Langworthy, Burlison, Raskin, Connolly, Krishnamoorthi, Ocasio-Cortez, Brown, Stansbury, Robert Garcia of California, Frost, Casar, Crockett, Goldman, and Moskowitz.

Present from the Committee on the Judiciary: Representatives Issa, Gaetz, Tiffany, Roy, Bishop, Spartz, Fitzgerald, Cline, Hageman, Lee, Armstrong, Nadler, Swalwell, Escobar, Dean, and Ivey.

Appearances:

For the COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY:

[redacted], SENIOR COUNSEL

[redacted], COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR

[redacted], DEPUTY STAFF DIRECTOR

[redacted], COUNSEL

[redacted], CHIEF COUNSEL FOR INVESTIGATIONS

[redacted], GENERAL COUNSEL

[redacted], STAFF DIRECTOR

[redacted], COUNSEL

[redacted], DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONS

[redacted], MINORITY CHIEF COUNSEL

[redacted], MINORITY SENIOR COUNSEL

[redacted], MINORITY COUNSEL

[redacted], MINORITY GAO DETAILEE

[redacted], MINORITY COUNSEL

[redacted], MINORITY DIRECTOR FOR OVERSIGHT AND POLICY

[redacted], MINORITY PROFESSIONAL STAFF MEMBER

[redacted], MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR

[redacted], MINORITY DEPUTY CHIEF OVERSIGHT COUNSEL

For the COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY:

[redacted], CHIEF CLERK

[redacted], GENERAL COUNSEL

[redacted], COUNSEL

[redacted], SENIOR PROFESSIONAL STAFF MEMBER

[redacted], PROFESSIONAL STAFF MEMBER

[redacted], CHIEF COUNSEL FOR OVERSIGHT

[redacted], CLERK

[redacted], MINORITY OVERSIGHT COUNSEL

[redacted], MINORITY CHIEF OVERSIGHT COUNSEL

[redacted], MINORITY DETAILEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SURVEILLANCE

[redacted], MINORITY PROFESSIONAL STAFF MEMBER

For ROBERT HUNTER BIDEN:

ABBE DAVID LOWELL

DAVID KOLANKSY

ISABELLA OISHI

Winston & Strawn, LLP

1901 L Street NW

Washington, D.C. 20036

[redacted]. Good morning, everyone. We'll go on the record now.

This is a deposition of Mr. Robert Hunter Biden. Chairman Comer and Chairman Jordan have requested this deposition as part of the House's formal impeachment inquiry into President Biden as well as the committees' respective oversight responsibilities. The committees are investigating whether sufficient grounds exist to draft Articles of Impeachment against President Biden for consideration by the full House.

Mr. Biden's testimony today is relevant to that impeachment inquiry. In addition, today's testimony is relevant to the committees' ongoing efforts to consider legislative reforms to Federal ethics and financial disclosure laws. Specifically, the committees seek legislative initiatives that provide transparency when the President's or Vice President's family members engage in financial transactions with foreign nationals, foreign companies, or foreign governments.

On February 14, 2024, the House Oversight and Judiciary Committees reissued subpoenas for Mr. Biden to appear at the deposition today, on February 28th of 2024. We will now mark the February 14, 2024, subpoenas as exhibit No. 1, please.

[Biden Exhibit No. 1
was marked for identification.]

[redacted]. On February 22, 2024, the committees noticed today's deposition.

We will now mark the February 22, 2024, notices as exhibit 2 to this deposition.

[Biden Exhibit No. 2
was marked for identification.]

[redacted]. Would the witness please state your name for the record.

Mr. Biden. Robert Hunter Biden.

[redacted]. Thank you, sir.

Could counsel for Mr. Biden please state your name for the record.

Mr. Lowell. Abbe Lowell, David Kolanksy, Bella Oishi from Winston & Strawn representing Mr. Biden.

[redacted]. Thank you very much.

My name is [redacted], and I am general counsel with Chairman Comer's staff.

I'll now have everyone else from the committees who are in the room introduce themselves as well. We have a number of people in the room. I think it would be best to probably start with the table, and then we can work our way around the back.

[redacted]. [redacted], Chairman Comer's staff.

[redacted]. [redacted], chief counsel for investigations, Chairman Comer staff.

Chairman Comer. James Comer.

[redacted]. I'm [redacted]. I'm a staffer with Mr. Jordan on the House

Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Jordan. Jim Jordan, Ohio-4.

[redacted]. [redacted], with Chairman Jordan's staff.

[redacted]. [redacted], with Ranking Member Nadler's staff on Judiciary.

Mr. Nadler. Jerry Nadler.

[redacted]. [redacted], with Ranking Member Nadler's staff on the Judiciary Committee.

[redacted]. [redacted], House Oversight Committee, Ranking Member Raskin's staff.

Mr. Raskin. Jamie Raskin, ranking member of the Oversight Committee.

[redacted]. [redacted], with Ranking Member Raskin.

[redacted]. We can go to the back now.

[redacted]. [redacted], Chairman Comer's staff.

[redacted]. [redacted], Chairman Comer's staff.

[redacted]. [redacted], Chairman Jordan's staff.

[redacted]. [redacted], Chairman Jordan's staff.

Mr. Tiffany. Tom Tiffany, Wisconsin-7.

Ms. Lee. Laurel Lee, Florida's 15th.

Mr. Issa. Darrell Issa, California.

Mr. Fallon. Pat Fallon, Texas-4.

Mr. Gaetz. Matt Gaetz, House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Bishop. Dan Bishop, North Carolina-8.

Mr. Fry. Russell Fry, South Carolina.

Mr. Timmons. William Timmons, South Carolina-4.

Mr. Casar. Greg Casar, Texas-35.

Mr. Biggs. Andy Biggs, Arizona-5.

Mr. Langworthy. Nick Langworthy, New York-23.

Mr. Armstrong. Kelly Armstrong, North Dakota.

[redacted]. [redacted], Chairman Jordan's staff.

[redacted]. [redacted], Judiciary Democrats.

[redacted]. [redacted], Oversight minority.

Ms. Hageman. Harriet Hageman, State of Wyoming.

Mr. Roy. Chip Roy, Texas-21.

Mr. Swalwell. Eric Swalwell, California.

Ms. Stansbury. Congresswoman Melanie Stansbury, New Mexico-1.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. Raja Krishnamoorthi, Illinois-8.

[redacted]. [redacted], Ranking Member Nadler's staff.

[redacted]. [redacted], Ranking Member Nadler's staff.

Mr. Goldman. Dan Goldman from New York.

Ms. Dean. Madeleine Dean from Pennsylvania, Judiciary.

[redacted]. [redacted], Oversight minority.

[redacted]. [redacted], Oversight minority.

[redacted]. [redacted], Oversight minority.

[redacted]. [redacted], Oversight minority.

[redacted] [redacted] House Oversight, Democratic staff.

[redacted]. [redacted], Oversight minority.

[redacted]. Thank you. I think that's everyone.

I will now review the ground rules and guidelines that we will follow during today's deposition. The committees will conduct today's deposition in accordance with the House's regulations for the use of deposition authority. This regulation is

incorporated verbatim into the rules for the Committee on Oversight and Accountability at rule 15 and the Committee on the Judiciary with rule 11.

Our questioning will proceed in rounds. The majority will ask questions for 1 hour, and then the minority will have an opportunity to ask questions for an equal period of time if they choose. There will be one staff counsel per side asking the questions during each round. To the extent Members have questions for the witness, they will be propounded during their side's respective rounds.

The clock will stop if the witness needs to confer with counsel when counsel for the witness is speaking and when Members are speaking during the opposite side's round. We will alternate back and forth until there are no more questions, and the deposition is over. We ordinarily take a short break at the end of each hour, but if you would like to take a break apart from that, please just let us know.

As you can see, there is an official reporter taking down everything we say to make a written record, so we ask that you give verbal responses to all questions. Mr. Biden, do you understand that?

Mr. Biden. I do.

[redacted]. So the court reporter can take down a clear record, please try and speak clearly so the court reporter can understand and so the people at the end of the table can hear you. It is important that we do not talk over one another or interrupt each other if we can help it, and that goes for everybody present at today's deposition.

We want you to answer our questions in a complete and truthful manner. If you do not understand one of our questions or need clarification about what we are seeking, please let us know. If you do not know the answer to a question or do not remember, please tell us what you do know and what you do remember. It is okay to tell us if you learned information from someone else, just indicate how you came to know that

information.

If there are things you do not know or cannot remember, just say so, and please inform us who, to the best of your knowledge, might be able to provide a more complete answer to the question.

By law, you are required to answer the questions from Congress truthfully. Do you understand that?

Mr. Biden. I do.

[redacted]. This also applies to questions posed by congressional staff in a deposition. Do you understand that?

Mr. Biden. I do.

[redacted]. Witnesses who knowingly provide false testimony could be subject to criminal prosecution for perjury. This includes, for example, stating that you do not recall or remember something when in fact you do. Do you understand this?

Mr. Biden. I do.

[redacted]. Furthermore, you cannot tell half-truths or exclude information necessary to make statements accurate. You are required to provide all information that would make your response truthful. A deliberate failure to disclose information can constitute a false statement. Do you understand this?

Mr. Biden. I do.

[redacted]. Is there any reason you are unable to provide truthful answers to today's questions?

Mr. Biden. No.

[redacted]. The Federal rules of evidence, criminal and civil procedures, are not applicable for today's deposition. Under the House deposition regulation, a witness' attorneys may not instruct a witness to refuse to answer a question except to preserve a

privilege. The House recognizes constitutionally based privileges and not necessarily those privileges derived from common law.

Finally, I will make note for the Members and staff that the contents of what we discuss in the deposition today is confidential under the House deposition regulation. Under the rules, the chairman and ranking minority member shall consult before any release of testimony, transcripts, including portions thereof.

Mr. Swalwell. Hey, Chairman, about that, parliamentary inquiry, when are you going to release this transcript?

[redacted]. I'm going to get to that in one moment, sir.

Mr. Swalwell. I'm asking the chairman, not you.

Chairman Comer, when are you going to release the transcript on this?

Chairman Comer. We're conducting the deposition.

Mr. Swalwell. Yeah, but you've got 91 of them buried and --

Chairman Comer. I don't care what your question is.

Mr. Nadler. Well, I care what his question is. When are you going to release the transcript? There are 91 transcripts that haven't been released yet.

Chairman Comer. We will release the deposition -- the transcripts like we always do when we agree to release the deposition, the transcripts.

Mr. Swalwell. Shouldn't the witness know?

[redacted]. Yeah, we want to put the transcript out within a day.

Mr. Nadler. Within a day? Very good. Thank you.

[redacted]. We'll do our best, yeah.

Mr. Swalwell. In English or Russian?

[redacted]. Excuse me? What'd you say?

Chairman Comer. We've already answered the question, Eric, and we're not

going to tolerate outbursts like we had the last time.

Mr. Nadler. He said within a day. That's fine.

[redacted]. This means it is a violation of House and committee rules to disclose content of the deposition prior to its official release. For this reason --

Mr. Nadler. Can you speak a little louder, please.

[redacted]. For this reason, the marked exhibits that we will use today will remain with the court reporter so that they can go in the official transcript, and any copies of those exhibits will be kept at the table, returned to us when we wrap up.

It is the intent of the chairman to release the deposition transcript as soon as practical after receipt of the transcript, hopefully within 24 hours of receipt. If Ranking Member Raskin or Ranking Member Nadler choose to raise an objection to the release of such transcript, we ask that they do so with this timeframe in mind.

Before we begin the first round of questions, we will afford the minority, the witness, and counsel for the witness the opportunity to offer any preliminary remarks. We'll start with the minority to allow them remarks, and then we'll proceed with you, Mr. Biden, if you would like to.

Mr. Raskin. [redacted], I just want the record to reflect that Mr. Moskowitz, Mr. Ivey, Ms. Ocasio-Cortez, Mr. Connolly, Mr. Frost have arrived and are present.

[redacted]. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Raskin. Oh, and Ms. Crockett has arrived as well.

Mr. Lowell. Thank you, [redacted].

[redacted]. Thank you.

Mr. Lowell. Your reciting the rules are exactly accurate, but I'd be remiss if I didn't point out, for example, in the question that was asked by one of the Members, that, in addition to that, you and your colleagues and I have had conversations and

exchanges about how this will proceed as well, which may or may not be included in the written rules of the committee or in the written rules of the House.

But there's nothing that you've said that ought to turn into some conflict about that. For example, on the issue of the release of the transcript, there is an outside limit that it has to be done no later than 36 and preferably 24, as one example. And, in terms of the other issues that you said, I don't know that that will come up, so let's see if it does. Otherwise, we're prepared to begin, and Mr. Biden does have an opening statement.

[redacted]. Thank you, sir.

And, Mr. Biden, you can give your opening statement whenever you would like.

Mr. Biden. Thank you.

I am here today to provide the committees with the one uncontestable fact that should end the false premise of this inquiry: I did not involve my father in my business, not while I was a practicing lawyer, not in my investments or transactions, domestic or international, not as a board member, and not as an artist, never.

You read this fact in the many letters that have been sent to you over the last year as part of your so-called impeachment investigation. You heard this fact when I said it weeks ago standing outside of this building. You heard this fact from a parade of other witnesses, former colleagues, and business partners of mine, including my uncle, who has testified before you in similar proceedings. And now, today, you hear this fact directly from me.

For more than a year, your committees have hunted me in your partisan political pursuit of my dad. You have trafficked in innuendo, distortion, and sensationalism, all the while ignoring the clear and convincing evidence staring you in the face: You do not have evidence to support the baseless and MAGA-motivated conspiracies about my

father because there isn't any.

You have built your entire partisan house of cards on lies told by the likes of Gal Luft, Tony Bobulinski, Alexander Smirnov, and Jason Galanis. Luft, who is a fugitive, has been indicted for his lies and other crimes; Smirnov, who has made you dupes in carrying out a Russian disinformation campaign waged against my father, has been indicted for his lies; Bobulinski, who has been exposed for the many false statements he has made; and Galanis, who is serving 14 years in prison for fraud.

Rather than follow the facts as they've been laid out before you in bank records, financial statements, correspondence, and other witness testimony, you continue your frantic search to prove the lies you and those you rely upon keep peddling. Yes, they are lies.

To be clear, I have made mistakes in my life, and I have squandered opportunities and privileges that were afforded to me. I know that. I am responsible for that. And I am making amends for that. But my mistakes and my shortcomings are my own and not my father's, who has done nothing but devote his entire life to public service and trying to make this country a better place to live.

During my battle with addiction, my father was there for me. He helped save my life. His love and support made it possible for me to get sober, stay sober, and rebuild my life as a father, a son, a husband, and a brother. What he got in return for being a loving, supportive parent is a barrage of hate-filled conspiracy theories that hatched this sham impeachment inquiry and continue to fuel unrelenting personal attacks against him and me.

Over the last year, Republicans have taken my communications out of context, relied on documents that have been altered, and cherry-picked snippets of financial or other records to misrepresent what really happened. Examples of this include a few references to my family in emails or texts that I sent when I was in the darkest days of my

addiction. If you try to do that today, my answers will reveal your tactics and demonstrate the truth that my father was never involved in any of my businesses.

My testimony today should put an end to this baseless and destructive political charade. You have wasted valuable time and resources attacking me and my family for your own political gain when you should be fixing the real problems in this country that desperately need your attention. Thank you.

[redacted]. Thank you, sir. Would you like us to mark that as an exhibit into the record or do you just --

Mr. Lowell. He just read it into the record. I think that's fine.

[redacted]. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Goldman. Mr. Chairman, or counsel, do you have -- it sounds like there's a scope agreement that you reached with --

[redacted]. We didn't reach any scope agreement. We agreed to send Mr. Lowell topics that we were interested in pursuing.

Mr. Lowell. I would say that we don't have an agreement that specifies exactly what will or will not be asked. We have topics that you sent, but I made very clear to counsel for the majority what topics would be off limits given the stated purpose of this event, which is, as you just stated, an inquiry into the possible impeachment resolution and the oversight on the kinds of topics that you said. And we'll have to see whether or not that is or what is not going to be done today, but we'll be premature until they try.

Mr. Goldman. So there's nothing in writing?

Mr. Lowell. There is something in writing.

Mr. Goldman. Can the minority please see that?

Mr. Lowell. The exchange between counsel for the committees and myself is an exchange between us. I don't know that it's -- right now, I don't necessarily even have

it. I mean, I do have my copy, but I don't think it should be something that slows us down until somebody tries to go outside the parameters of one of those conditions, Congressman.

[redacted]. Can we swear in the witness, please.

The Reporter. Will you raise your right hand for me, please. Do you solemnly declare and affirm under penalty of perjury that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

The Witness. I do.

[redacted]. Good morning, Mr. Biden.

Mr. Nadler. Mr. Chairman?

[redacted]. If we could pause the clock.

Mr. Nadler. Let me -- can I just ask that people try to speak up loudly because it's very difficult to hear in here. There are no mics.

[redacted]. I'll do my best, sir.

Mr. Nadler. Not just you, everybody.

[redacted]. Thank you. We'll now begin. The clock reads 10:16 a.m.

EXAMINATION

BY [redacted]:

Q Thank you, again, Mr. Biden, for being here this morning. I'd like to begin with discussing your professional and educational background. Could you just give us a brief overview of your background?

A Sure. I wrote it down because it's long. I'm a graduate of Georgetown University, a former member of the Jesuit Volunteer Corps Northwest. I graduated from Yale Law School, where I was an editor of the Yale Law and Policy Review and the Yale Law and Humanities Journal and received honors for my thesis work on law and policy. I

was a vice president at a major national bank, where I worked in the General Counsel's Office and then as manager of a unit within the Fraud Department.

I was executive director of e-commerce policy coordination with the Department of Commerce during the Clinton administration. I founded and built a successful law firm, Oldaker, Biden & Belair, and represented not-for-profit institutions, including close to a dozen primarily Jesuit universities all over the country from Philadelphia to Los Angeles, from Detroit to Denver, and everywhere in between. I then founded and built the successful small business in advising global infrastructure and alternative investment clients.

I have served on the following boards: I was appointed by President Bush to the National Passenger Rail Corporation Board, Amtrak, and rose to the level of vice chairman and head of the Corporate Governance Committee. I served on the board of the Center for National Policy as chairman. I served on the board of the Jesuit Volunteer Corps Northwest. I served on the board of the Truman National Security Project as chairman. I served on the chairman's advisory board of the National Democratic Institute.

I served on the board for Catholic Charities in Washington, D.C. I served on the board of the U.S./U.N. World Food Program, which supports the largest humanitarian organization in the world and is the past winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, an organization that feeds over 70 million people each day. And I was chairman of that board.

I was also an adjunct professor for 4 years at Georgetown University's School for Foreign Service in its master's program. And, finally, I served as of counsel -- excuse me, of counsel at a major international law firm of Boies, Schiller & Flexner. And I have been member of the bars of the States of Connecticut, the District of Columbia, the Federal Court of Claims, and the bar of the U.S. Supreme Court. I have recently written a memoir, "Beautiful Things," and today I'm an artist. And that's my background.

Q Thank you for providing that background. I want to begin by --

Mr. Lowell. One thing. I'm sorry to interrupt you. Would it be possible to include Mr. Biden's resume as an exhibit so that it's a full record?

[redacted]. Yes, sir.

Mr. Lowell. We have those for you.

[redacted]. We can mark this as an exhibit.

Mr. Lowell. Thank you.

[redacted]. This will be exhibit 3.

[Biden Exhibit No. 3
was marked for identification.]

BY [redacted]:

Q I want to begin by discussing some of your foreign business dealings, and I'd like to begin in China. The first matter that I would like to discuss is Jonathan Li and BHR Partners. Can you please provide the committee with who Jonathan Li was?

A Jonathan Li was, first and foremost, became a friend of mine before I entered business with him.

Q And approximately when was that?

A I believe as early as 2014.

Q Did there come a time when you went with your father on Air Force Two to Beijing, China, for one of your father's official government trips?

A I traveled with my father on that trip as I've traveled with my father my entire life.

Q And, when you traveled on Air Force Two for that trip, when you all were in Beijing, did there come a time when you introduced your father, who was Vice President at the time, to Jonathan Li?

A When we returned from an event to the hotel, there was a rope line, and Jonathan Li was in the lobby of the hotel where I was going to meet him for coffee. In that line I introduced my dad to Jonathan Li and a friend of his, and they shook hands and I believe probably took a photograph. And then my father went up to his room, and I went to have coffee with Jonathan Li.

Q Who was the friend that was with Jonathan Li?

A I don't remember his name directly. It was a friend of Jonathan's.

Q Prior to introducing your father to Jonathan Li, what did you tell your father about Jonathan Li?

A I don't -- didn't tell him anything about Jonathan Li.

Q At the time that you did introduce your father to Jonathan Li, did you or any of your business associates have any potential business with Jonathan Li?

A I was working with Jonathan on a potential that he had an idea for creating a private equity fund based in China to do cross-border investments.

Q And this private equity fund, what kind of -- what was the source of the money that was being invested?

A There was no source of money at that time.

Q So you're testifying here today that it wasn't money from China that was being invested to be deployed in international areas?

A Now, when you --

Mr. Lowell. I'm sorry; [redacted], when you say money from China, what does China mean?

BY [redacted]:

Q It means from any of the state-owned entities or any of the Chinese entities that have a close association with -- with the Chinese Government.

A At that time, I was not an equity holder in anything that Jonathan was doing. I did not have any notion of the exact source of funds.

Q Sitting here now, are you aware that Jonathan Li does invest Chinese Government funds?

A I am not aware of that.

Q Was the company that was being thought of or being formed, the investment fund, was that BHR Partners?

A Yes, ultimately, it became BHR Partners. Jonathan's original fund was called Bohai. He had been in private equity with one of the first privately held private equity firms in China.

Q And the "B" in BHR Partners stood for Bohai, correct?

A Yes.

Q And the "H" in BHR Partners stood for Harvest? Do I have that correct?

A Yes.

Q And that's related to who? Who was associated with Harvest?

A I believe that the principal for Harvest was Henry Zhao.

Q And the "R" in BHR was Rosemont Seneca. Is that correct?

A No. It was Rosemont Seneca Thornton.

Q And Rosemont Seneca Thornton, just so the committee understands, Rosemont would've been Devon Archer, correct?

A Yes.

Q Seneca would've been you, correct?

A Yes.

Q And then the Thornton would've been Jimmy Bulger, correct?

A Yep, James Bulger.

Q And the idea for this equity fund that the business associates were going to invest in is that it had raised approximately $4.2 million. Do I have that number correct?

A I think from the equity stake from the partners.

Q And so, in order to purchase a 10 percent share of this equity to get -- to receive equity in BHR Partners, each individual partner had to put up approximately $420,000. Is that correct?

A Yes.

Q And so, if Devon Archer wanted to get a 10-percent share, let's say, he would have needed to put up $420,000 in equity to get that 10 percent share in BHR Partners. Is that right?

A In some way, he would have to put up $420,000. I believe that's correct.

Q The committee has subpoenaed bank records for a company called Rosemont Seneca Thornton. And, in those records for Rosemont Seneca Thornton, we see that the first payments in order for -- to get the 10-percent equity into BHR occurred in January of 2014. Were you aware that there were -- is an investment of 10 percent for approximately $420,000 into BHR Partners by Rosemont Seneca Thornton in January of 2014?

Mr. Lowell. Can you show us that document, please?

[redacted]. Yes, we can. If we could please mark that as an exhibit.

[redacted]. This will be exhibit 4.

[Biden Exhibit No. 4
was marked for identification.]

Mr. Swalwell. Can the Members see that too?

Mr. Biden. What's the question?

Mr. Lowell. No, I want to see this first.

This exhibit starts on page 6, and it's a 2-page piece of paper, both of which are marked page 5, and yet they're not the same page 6. So can you explain?

[redacted]. Yeah. So they're two different client statements. So the first page is going to be January 30 -- you'll see it's for the period January 1 through 31 of 2014, and then the next one is February 1 through 28, 2014. We're going to stick with page 1 of this exhibit.

Mr. Lowell. So this is page six of two different monthly statements?

[redacted]. Correct. And we're going to stick with page one. Both of them refer to, as you'll see in the top right corner, Rosemont Seneca Thornton, LLC.

Mr. Lowell. Care of Devon Archer.

[redacted]. Correct.

Mr. Lowell. And now, on this page, can you point us to what was the basis of your question, please?

[redacted]. Yes, sir. If you look at the dates, so January 23rd, there is a wire fund sent. The beneficiary is BHR with account number 7727 for $167,000. And then, if you go down, there's a January 29th transaction, where wire funds are sent from -- and the beneficiary is Bohai Harvest RST Shanghai for $247,800 to the same account, the 7727. When you total those two up, it equals $414,800.

Mr. Lowell. Coming from Mr. Archer's account?

BY [redacted]:

Q Coming from the Rosemont Seneca Thornton account, which I will ask your client about in a moment. But my -- we'll go back to this -- original question is --

A Coming from Devon Archer's account.

Q I'll come back to that in a second.

A Well, I'm just telling you, this is Devon Archer's account. It's not mine.

Q I will get to that --

A I have no control or --

Q Sir, I would just ask that you let me ask the questions, and we can cover that ground. I promise.

A Okay. I thought you did.

Q Were you aware that this 10 percent of equity was purchased in January of 2014, to purchase BHR Partners, 10 percent?

Mr. Lowell. Of Mr. Archer?

BY [redacted]:

Q I'm not saying Mr. Archer. Were you aware of this transaction?

A I can't recall whether I was aware of the exact transaction at the time. But, again, I'd like to point out, this is not my account. This is not my money. I don't have any control or authority over this account.

Q What was your role at Rosemont Seneca Partners?

A Rosemont Seneca Partners was my primary business. I was the president of Rosemont Seneca Partners.

[redacted]. I'm now going to show you exhibit --

The Witness. I've done -- CEO, director, or something like that.

[redacted]. Now I'm going to show you exhibit 5, which is going to be bank documents from Rosemont Seneca Thornton.

[Biden Exhibit No. 5
was marked for identification.]

BY [redacted]:

Q In this document -- this is going to be now marked as exhibit 5 -- this is a document that was obtained via subpoena related to Rosemont Seneca Thornton, and it

shows in this document, that the client contacts, one of them is Rosemont Seneca Partners, LLC. Do you see where it says that, sir?

A I see where it says that.

Q And it says IBO, which is term for intended beneficial owner, entity.

A Okay.

Q Is that there as well, across from Rosemont Seneca Partners, LLC?

A I have never heard the term "IBO," but it does say IBO across from Rosemont Seneca Partners, LLC.

Mr. Swalwell. Can we get more copies? None of us have copies of what you're referring to.

[redacted]. So it's fair to say that this particular document shows that Rosemont Seneca Partners is affiliated with Rosemont Seneca Thornton, correct?

Mr. Lowell. What do you mean by affiliated?

[redacted]. Well, it says it's the intended beneficial owner of the -- of Rosemont Seneca Thornton.

Mr. Lowell. I see what you're asking. You're asking whether the document you put in front of the person that you're asking the question to has a line that says that.

[redacted]. Yes.

Mr. Lowell. Okay. If that's what you're asking, the document will speak for itself. Go ahead and --

The Witness. Yeah, the document speaks for itself. It says that.

BY [redacted]:

Q And then I want to also discuss a second portion of -- another 10 percent that was purchased out of the Rosemont Seneca Bohai account to purchase another 10 percent equity into BHR Partners. Were you aware that, in December of 2014, that

there was another 10 percent purchase out of the Rosemont Seneca Bohai account for 10 percent of BHR Partners?

A No, not directly aware, no. Again, I would like to state for the -- for everybody here is that neither of these accounts were under my control nor affiliated with me. Any of this is outside of my knowledge.

Q Well, Rosemont Seneca Bohai, let's just go through the name real quickly, the Rosemont deals with Devon, correct?

A Well --

Q Pertains to Devon?

A -- originally Devon's firm was Rosemont Capital. Originally my firm was Seneca Global Advisors. I changed the name of my firm to Rosemont Seneca Partners, which is not Rosemont Seneca Thornton, and it's not Rosemont Seneca Bohai. If Devon set up accounts on his own under those names, they were not at my behest, not for my benefit, and not in -- I had no control or understanding of.

Q Isn't it true that you received your money from Burisma in 2014 and 2015 into the Rosemont Seneca Bohai account?

A I don't know exactly what account. I know the money went to Devon because of issues as it relates to being able to make the wire, and Devon then sent me my portion of my board fee to me.

Q Isn't it also true that you received $142,300 from Kazakhstani oligarch to purchase a car into the Rosemont Seneca Bohai account --

Mr. Lowell. I'm sorry. When you say "Kazakhstani oligarch," could you identify the person and what makes him --

[redacted] Sure. Kenes Rakishev.

Mr. Lowell. Let me finish please, and what makes him a oligarch?

[redacted]. The amount of money that he has and his location of where he is. He is -- Kenes Rakishev is a very wealthy individual in Kazakhstan.

Mr. Lowell. Okay. So now can you ask the question again?

[redacted]. Did you receive $142,300 payment from Kenes Rakishev into the Rosemont Seneca Bohai account?

Mr. Lowell. Can you show us that document, please?

[redacted]. Sure.

Mr. Lowell. I mean, just as a timesaving measure, if you're going to ask him about something that's in a document, you'll get there faster by showing him the document.

BY [redacted]:

Q I'll come back to that.

Did you receive payments from other foreign sources into the Rosemont Seneca Bohai account?

A Again, you say "foreign sources." The people that I did business with that were from other countries other than the United States, the answer is, yes; I have received -- but not -- I don't know whether they went into Rosemont Seneca Bohai or that they went into Rosemont Seneca Thornton. I had no control. I have no authority over those accounts, and I have no view inside of it. There was no transparency to me that I know of.

Q Did you receive payments from the Rosemont Seneca Bohai account into your other accounts, such as Owasco PC or other Robert Hunter Biden accounts?

A I can't say today whether they came from anybody other than Devon Archer. What account they came from I'm not sure, because I had, again, no notion of what the name of Devon Archer's bank account, which he named on his own, not me.

Q Devon Archer testified in a prior interview that the Rosemont Seneca Bohai was a 50/50 handshake between you and him. Is that true or incorrect?

A Not that I remember at all, no. It obviously was not a 50/50 handshake based upon the documents that I see here because I did not receive 50 percent of what I've seen in documents that have been shown to me.

Q He also said that you were the corporate secretary of Rosemont Seneca Bohai. Is that incorrect?

A The corporate secretary?

Q Yes, sir.

A I didn't even know that there was such a thing.

Mr. Lowell. Do you have the document that indicates that company as having a company so that there would be a secretary? Do you have that too?

[redacted]. We provided you the Rosemont Seneca Bohai bank accounts, so --

The Witness. No, I'm saying --

[redacted]. -- in advance we provided these to you.

The Witness. -- is there a registration that says --

[redacted]. I'm not going to answer questions, sir. We provided the documents to you. In addition --

Mr. Lowell. I will state for the record that there's no document that you sent out of the hundred and -- 200-plus documents and thousands of pages that indicates what you just said.

The Witness. Yes.

[redacted]. I referred to Devon Archer making the statement. I didn't refer to a document from a bank record.

Mr. Lowell. Okay. Please, continue.

BY [redacted]:

Q Based upon the records that we've reviewed, you and Devon Archer were unable to purchase this 20 percent equity into BHR Partners until after your father met with Jonathan Li in Beijing.

A I completely disagree with the characterization and the way that you just stated that. It had nothing to do with the meeting with Jonathan Li.

Mr. Nadler. I can't hear.

The Witness. I can say for certain I disagree with the way that you just characterized that. It bears no resemblance to the truth. My father shaking Jonathan Li's hand in a rope line in a hotel had nothing to do with my relationship with him. I had an over 10-year relationship with Jonathan Li. He was a friend, and he was also a very astute businessperson. He was educated in London, and we have become, not just friends, but I trusted him to be a very capable businessperson.

Q But, during that 10-year friendship that you had with him, you were never able to actually purchase any equity into BHR Partners until your father met with him in Beijing?

A I didn't --

Mr. Lowell. Sorry, sorry. Just timing wise, you're suggesting that BHR came about at the beginning of their 10-year relationship?

[redacted]. I didn't say that. It's when they were permitted to invest in the company, when they could put in that 20 percent so that they could get a 20 percent equity did not occur until this meeting between Vice President Biden and Jonathan Li after he took Air Force Two to conduct this business --

Mr. Lowell. If you're saying, is a handshake the meeting, is that what you're

referring to?

[redacted]. Yes, sir.

Mr. Lowell. All right.

The Witness. I could say for the record, and I will probably say this 1,000 times, my father had absolutely no knowledge of, no involvement in, had no -- any way was -- awareness of my business relationship with Jonathan Li. And I could also say this, is that I did not have an equity stake in BHR until my father left office in 2017 to begin with.

[redacted]. I want to now, if we could please show -- this will be exhibit 6.

[Biden Exhibit No. 6
was marked for identification.]

BY [redacted]:

Q This is going to be an excerpt from your book, "Beautiful Things." We are going to refer everyone to page 122.

Sir, when did you publish this book?

A It was published in the spring, I believe in the spring, early summer of 2021.

Q I'd like you to read into the record, if you could, it's going to be the second -- sorry, the first full paragraph, so it begins with, "I learned of Beau's tumor."

A "I learned of Beau's tumor just months before I received a call regarding Burisma and Devon Archer."

Mr. Nadler. Could you hold a minute until we get a copy?

[redacted]. Pause the clock.

[redacted]. Stop the clock.

The Witness. Stop the clock.

[Recess.]

BY [redacted]:

Q All right. Sir, if you could please begin.

A "I learned of Beau's tumor just months before I received a call regarding Burisma from Devon Archer, one of my business colleagues from Rosemont Seneca. Our deal with the biggest potential was a partnership with the Chinese private equity fund seeking to invest Chinese capital in companies outside the country. I was an unpaid advisor in that deal and to this day have collected no money from the transaction. Yet, like everything else, it has joined the ever-swelling club of Trump's conspiratorial delusions, from birtherism to QAnon."

Q Stop there, sir. Stop right there. In here you talk about how you collected no money from the transaction.

A Yes.

Q And, during this excerpt or what you're writing here, you're discussing this meeting with Jonathan Li and your father and providing an explanation. Is that correct?

Mr. Lowell. No, actually, it's the next paragraph where he discusses what you just described.

The Witness. Yeah, I can read the next paragraph so that I could -- if that's what you're asking me about.

BY [redacted]:

Q No, just in general, this is what you were talking about? This is what you were referring to here?

A Not in the paragraph you had me read. I did not talk about Jonathan Li or anything to do with what you just asked. So, if you'd like me to read the next full paragraph, I can do that because it gives a fuller answer to your question.

Q You can read the next full paragraph.

A Okay. "In 2013 --" I think it was 2014, but I'm not sure, because -- I think

this is a mistake because I'd learned of Beau's tumor just months before, it would be 2014, and I went on this trip, I believe, it was in 2014.

"In 2014, Dad asked --" it says, in 2013, but it should say 2014 -- "Dad asked my then teenage daughter, Finnegan, to join him on Air Force Two to Japan and then onto Beijing, where he was meeting with President Xi Jinping. Dad often asked his grandkids to accompany him on overseas trips. It was his chance to catch up. I jumped on the plane from Japan to China to spend time with them both. While we were in Beijing, Dad met with one of Devon's Chinese partners, Jonathan Li, in the lobby of the American delegation's hotel, just long enough to say hello and shake hands. I was meeting with Li as a courtesy call while I was in the country; the business deal had been signed more than a week earlier. Li and I then headed off for a cup of coffee."

Q So I want to refer you back up to the first paragraph you read, where you said, "Our deal with the biggest potential was a partnership with the Chinese private equity fund seeking to invest in Chinese capital in companies outside the country." What were you referring to there?

A I was referring to BHR.

Q BHR Partners, correct?

A Yes.

Q And then you say, "I was an unpaid advisor in that deal and to this day have collected no money from the transaction." Is that correct?

A Yes.

Q And, when you wrote this, it was approximately 2021. Is that right?

A I published it in 2021. I wrote it in 2020.

Q What you don't say in here is that you did get money from Jonathan Li, didn't you?

A I believe ultimately -- no, I did not get money from Jonathan Li.

Q I'd now like to show you bank records.

Mr. Lowell. Are you talking about a loan?

The Witness. The loan?

BY [redacted]:

Q He got money. Whether you want to call it a loan or --

A Okay. I'm sorry.

Q -- you want to call it a payment, did you get money from Jonathan Li is very clear?

A I was loaned my -- money against my equity stake in the company of which Jonathan Li was the majority partner of.

Q So, in this, when you say you collected no money in your book, the reality is that, just the year earlier, in 2019, you had received a $250,000 wire from Jonathan Li. Isn't that correct?

A To send back to him for the equity stake in the fund.

Q You never repaid the loan to Jonathan Li. Isn't that correct?

A Did I repay the loan?

Q Correct.

A I sold my equity interest in it, and part of that is the assumption of the loan.

Q You never paid any money back to Jonathan Li, did you?

A What I'm telling you is that I sold my equity interest in BHR, and part of that arm's length transaction is the assumption of the loan, and that is between Jonathan Li and the equity holder.

Q And that equity holder is Kevin Morris, correct?

A Yes, it is.

Q What you did is in 2017 you took your BHR equity, which was being held by Devon Archer in the Rosemont Seneca Bohai account, and you transferred it into Skaneateles. Isn't that correct?

A I don't know how exactly that -- the transactions worked, but I do know that Skaneateles was the holder of the equity.

Q And you sold Skaneateles to Kevin Morris, correct?

A Yes, I did.

Q And you also have over $6.5 million loans with Kevin Morris, correct?

A I do not know the exact amount that I have with Kevin Morris, but, yes, I have loans with Kevin Morris.

Q So you never paid back this $250,000 wire to Jonathan Li because you then gave Skaneateles over to Kevin Morris who absorbed the loan, right?

Mr. Lowell. Did you just use the word "gave"?

[redacted]. Yes.

Mr. Lowell. You can answer that question if you can.

The Witness. Say the question again. Maybe you can say it the right way this time.

BY [redacted]:

Q You then took your Skaneateles share --

A Yep.

Q -- which owed $250,000 to Kevin Morris, correct?

A No.

Q Excuse me, to Jonathan Li, correct?

A There was a debt against the equity that was owed to BHR, yes -- or to Jonathan.

Q And you then sold that over to Kevin Morris, correct?

A I sold my equity stake, which included a note that was owed to Kevin Morris in an arm's length transaction that was negotiated by our lawyers and was executed by myself and Kevin.

Q Other things you don't mention in your book are that your father actually wrote a college recommendation for one of Jonathan Li's children. Isn't that correct?

A I believe that he did, yes. And as I -- I don't remember the exact date, but I will say this, is Jonathan, as I said before, was a very close friend, became a close friend of mine. And although I have not had any contact with Jonathan for a long time, I still consider he and his family to be near to my heart. They have -- and I knew his son.

And there was a rule in my family, my dad was often asked to write recommendations for hundreds of people that -- I'm sure over the course of the last 50 years. But the rule was is that, if you were going to ask, that they had to be close friends; you had to know them well. And I knew both Jonathan, and I knew his son, who was applying to universities here in the United States.

Q Devon Archer also testified that you placed your father on speak --

A May I ask a question?

Q Not of me, sir.

A Oh, I'm sorry. Okay.

Q You're the witness.

A I apologize. I just wanted a clarification about something, but go ahead. I apologize.

Q Devon Archer testified that you also placed your father on speakerphone during a meeting with Jonathan Li. Do you recall that?

A No, I don't recall it. Is there a specific time? I was with Jonathan Li for a

number of times over the course of 10 years, and as I've said -- well, go ahead.

Q Did you ever place your father on speakerphone with any of your business associates?

A Over the course of the last 30 years when speakerphone was invented on a cell phone? I'm certain my dad has called me. My dad calls me like I'm sure a lot of your parents do or a lot of you do with your children, and if I'm with people that are friends of mine, I'll have him say hi.

Q By placing him on speakerphone?

A I don't know whether it's speakerphone. Devon, I think, what did he testify, that over the course of our 10-year relationship I was -- maybe 10 or 20 times that he can remember. He can't recall the specific times that I put my dad on speakerphone when I was at a dinner or at a social event, so that means, over the course of 10 years, twice a year, my dad would call me, and I would be in the middle of a dinner, and I always answer his call. I always answer his call, based upon my life's experience. And you're telling me, so two times a year over the course of a 10 years, maybe more, or 15 years with Devon Archer, yes, that probably did happen.

Q And why would you place your dad on speakerphone? And the reason I ask is that if I were -- my dad were to call me right now --

A I'm surprised my dad hasn't called me right now, and if he did, I would put him on speakerphone to say hi to you and to Congressman Raskin and everybody else in the room. It is nothing nefarious literally. You understand my relationship with my family. When my dad was 29 years old, he woke up one day, went to work, and got a phone call and lost his wife and his daughter. And, in that same accident, he also lost almost my brother and myself. And then, when I was 46 years old, my 47-year-old brother died.

And in our family, when you have a call from -- I call him or he calls me or I call one of my -- his grandkids or one of my children, you always pick up the phone. It's something that we always do. And you can ask anybody that I know; it does not have to do with Devon. If my dad calls me and I'm in the middle of something, I either get up from the table or I answer the phone at the table if it's with people that I have a long-term relationship with.

[redacted]. I now want to show exhibit No. 7.

[Biden Exhibit No. 7
was marked for identification.]

[redacted]. It's going to be a bank record from Rosemont Seneca Bohai.

Mr. Lowell. Is this different than the first exhibit?

The Witness. Is it --

[redacted]. Page one. So it will say page 6 of 8 at the top. This is Rosemont Seneca Bohai --

Mr. Lowell. I'm sorry to interrupt you. Page 6, but the other ones were page 6. Is this a different month?

[redacted]. Different account.

Mr. Lowell. Okay. Understood. Go ahead.

The Witness. It's just interesting it's on page 6.

BY [redacted]:

Q What we see here is a bank statement for Rosemont Seneca Bohai. In the account statement on April 22nd of 2014, there is a payment that -- a wire that comes into the Rosemont Seneca Bohai account for $142,300. Devon Archer was asked about this during his transcribed interview, and he stated that it was -- he believed it was a car for you, but he didn't know about the transaction. So now I'll ask you, did you receive

any proceeds or any money for a car into the Rosemont Seneca Bohai account?

Mr. Lowell. Can I just ask you -- you have Devon Archer's testimony. He said he didn't know about this transaction. It's his account sending $142,000, and he say -- he didn't know what -- he didn't do that?

The Witness. Can I see what he said?

[redacted]. We do have the transcript.

Mr. Lowell. I mean, you just characterized it as him saying he didn't know about this transaction.

[redacted]. He knew -- we'll just give you the transcript, and that way you can have it.

I'm going to read it into the record while we're doing this.

Question: "Why did Rosemont Seneca Bohai receive this $142,000 payment from Rakishev?"

Answer: "It was for a car."

Question: "Whose car?"

Answer: "Also, let me clarify, I didn't -- I didn't like do the actual banking, so --"

"Who did?"

Answer: "Sebastian Momtazi."

Question: "And Sebastian --"

Answer: "So, like, I wouldn't have sent these wires or received these wires or, like, pressed go or -- he would have some rubber stamp, you know, and do it. Hunter interfaced with him. But I know this was for a car."

Question: "Did Sebastian work for Rosemont? One of --"

Answer: "Yeah."

Question: "-- the Rosemonts?"

"He worked for one of them. I don't know -- I forget --"

"Do you remember which one?"

Answer: "Rosemont Realty. First Rosemont Capital, then transitioned to Rosemont Realty."

Question: "What was the purpose of this wire?"

Answer: "It was for a car."

Question: "For whose car?"

Answer: "For Hunter's car."

Mr. Lowell. Yeah, okay. So what's the question then?

BY [redacted]:

Q My question to you is, who sent you this money for the car?

A Devon Archer sent the money for the car from this account, so --

Q The wire is being received into Rosemont Seneca Bohai.

A So it goes out.

Mr. Lowell. -- two lines later.

The Witness. I don't --

BY [redacted]:

Q Who is Novatus? When the wire comes in for $142,300 --

A I've never seen Novatus. But, if you're asking me, does this money come from Kenes Rakishev, I can't answer directly because I don't have any full knowledge. All I know is that this -- that the money for the car came from Devon Archer from Rosemont Seneca Bohai, I assume, as you're showing me in this document.

Q Are you saying that all the money in Rosemont Seneca Bohai is Devon Archer's money?

A Yes.

Q So all of your Burisma payments that you get to Rosemont Seneca Bohai --

A Yes --

Q -- those are Devon Archer's Burisma payments?

A Until they're paid into my account, yes, because I have no signing authority, I have no transparency into this account, I have no way of making any withdrawals or making any -- writing checks from or requesting dollars from. I don't. I don't have any way to do anything with a bank account that is solely owned by Devon Archer.

Q Did you obtain custody of the car that was purchased for $142,300?

A I did, yes.

Q So you did get this car?

A I got a car, yes.

Mr. Lowell. You didn't ask him whether he got the car. You asked him whether or not all the money that went into the account was not his?

BY [redacted]:

Q Do you know who gave -- who sent the $142,300 in the Rosemont Seneca Bohai account the exact same amount that purchased the car?

A I do not know exactly how -- where that -- how it was purchased, but the car was purchased. I took possession of a car.

Q Who sent the money for $142,300 into the Rosemont Seneca Bohai account?

A As far as I knew, Devon.

Q Who sent the money from Novatus into the Rosemont Seneca Bohai account that was $142,300?

A Again, I don't know what Novatus is, but I believe that the money for the car was sent to Devon; then ultimately Devon purchased the car for me.

Q And Devon never told you who was providing the money for the car?

A No, I didn't say that. I'm saying to you, I'm not -- I don't know technically who Novatus is, so I can't answer what -- your question other than to say, my belief was that, but I do not know exactly who Novatus is. If you tell me Novatus is connected to Kenes Rakishev, then I accept that to be the fact. I have no issue with this.

They're telling you, is that I received a car and I know why I received a car. I received a car because I was helping, what I -- my understanding was is that I was engaged with Devon -- a way for Devon to engage me to help with his Rosemont Realty. It was payment. It was a cockamamie way to do it, but that's what my understanding was.

Q Did you ever introduce Kenes Rakishev to your father?

A Kenes Rakishev met my father, I believe, once at a dinner that I had for the World Food Program.

Q That dinner is at Cafe Milano?

A Yes.

Q Who else was at that dinner?

A I don't have the guest list in front of me, but I believe, to begin with it, was Father Karloutsos and his wife Xanthi, I believe Michael Karloutsos was also there. The CEO of the world -- U.S./U.N. World Food Program, Rick Leach was there. I can't remember which dinner there was also at --

Q What about Yelena Baturina?

A I don't know whether she was at this dinner or not.

Q But is your father -- have you ever introduced your father to Yelena Baturina?

A I don't think I ever introduced him to her. I think that she was also at a dinner over the course of the time in which Devon was engaged with Yelena Baturina.

Q And what about her husband, the mayor of Moscow?

A I've met him. I don't know -- I don't have any memory of my father meeting him, but I don't know.

Q And was it -- Karim Massimov also at one of these dinners?

A Yes, he was.

Q And did --

Mr. Lowell. Can I just be clear, when you say "one of these dinners," do you want to identify which dinner, because I think the guest list is different at various dinners.

[redacted]. Can you provide us with the guest list at the different dinners where you're --

Mr. Lowell. We don't have a written list, if that's what you mean. We thought by the subpoenas --

[redacted]. I'm not going to provide him with any list.

Mr. Lowell. -- that you have you did.

[redacted]. We can just say there were several dinners at Cafe Milano, correct?

Mr. Lowell. I wouldn't say that there were several dinners.

[redacted]. Two?

Mr. Lowell. You mean there were two.

BY [redacted]:

Q There were two dinners at Cafe Milano, correct?

A Well, I had many dinners at Cafe Milano. The two that -- you may be talking about two, but I've eaten at Cafe Milano dozens and dozens of times when I lived in Washington, D.C.

Q There are two dinners where your father goes to the different dinners, and

at the respective dinners, and I'm not saying they're all at the same time, but Yelena Baturina, the mayor of Moscow is at one of the dinners. Karim Massimov is at one of the dinners. Kenes Rakishev is at one of the dinners. Is that correct?

A I believe so, and I don't know who was at which dinner exactly when, but if you put it in front of me, I could decipher that for you. But I will say this: I've had dozens of dinners at Cafe Milano for dozens of -- for many, many different reasons, whether it was just to be with family or whether it was to be with friends or whether it was to be with friends and associates or whether it was to do, for instance, a dinner that was to -- a presentation for the U.S./U.N. World Food Program.

And, in one of the occasions that you're speaking about, the entire purpose of the dinner was to present, and there was a big screen at the end of the room. I got up and made a presentation. Rick leach got up, and he made a presentation about the World Food Program. Father Alex Karloutsos, who I've known since I was 2 years old and is one of my family's closest friends; Xanthi, his wife; Michael his son; and about a, you know, 8 or 10 other people, including people from the U.S./U.N. World Food Program were there. And my father stopped by to say hello, and he sat next to Father Alex as far as I can remember, and that was basically it. And I would do that all the time as it related to the U.S./U.N. World Food Program.

Q Was Vadym Pozharsky also at one of these dinners?

A I don't remember which dinner he was at, and I did not remember for a long time, but I do believe that Vadym was at one of these dinners, yes.

Q I now want to turn to CEFC. When did you begin doing work for CEFC?

A I officially began to do work for CEFC when the -- when I received a retainer from CEFC in early -- or spring of 2017.

[redacted]. I now want to show you an email titled "H to Zang Draft." It's

an email, an attachment. We received this from Rob Walker's attorney, exhibit 9.

[Biden Exhibit No. 9
was marked for identification.]

BY [redacted]:

Q Now, looking at this, the first page is an email and I'll read it into the record: "Forward: H to Zang Draft." It's from Rob Walker to Hunter Biden, dated March 22, 2016, and there's an attachment H to Zang.docx. And it says, "Take a look and let me know. Very simple. Once okay'd, I'll send to Joan to sign?"

But then, below, this particular email was forwarded. It's from Rob Walker, dated March 22, 2016. Again, subject H to Zang Draft to James Gilliar. It says, "Very simple. Take a look."

First, let's just discuss who these people are. Who is Rob Walker?

A Rob Walker is both a friend and business associate of mine. I met Rob Walker first in 1998, and we were both close, personal friends and eventually over time we did business together.

Q And he has a company Robinson Walker, LLC. Is that correct?

A If you tell me that's the name of it. I don't remember the --

Q I'll submit to you it is.

A Yeah.

Q James Gilliar, who is he?

A James Gilliar was first introduced to me by Rob Walker.

Q And does he have a company that you remember EEIG, which is an Abu Dhabi company?

A I didn't know that that was the name. I just knew James, and I didn't know their LLC names that they operate their businesses from.

Q And then, if we flip to the next page, it appears to be a letter on your letterhead, dated March 22, 2016. It's a draft.

Mr. Lowell. Well, first of all, that's not an accurate statement of what this is. This is a typed address and name. You call it his letterhead; it's not signed. You call it a draft; it's not stated his draft. Do you have any indication to Mr. Biden did this? You see the first pages have to do with --

[redacted]. I'm going to get into the -- I'll ask him if he did do it. I'm just trying to give a background for the record.

Mr. Lowell. I just wanted the record to be as clear --

[redacted]. Sure. I'll read it into the record.

Mr. Lowell. -- and as complete as we can be since it will be a transcript.

BY [redacted]:

Q Director Zang, and it says TBD where you would have an address. "Director Zang, I hope this letter finds you well. We anticipate working together on a number of opportunities in the U.S. and abroad. I believe we have presented a collection of projects that parallel the interests of you and your team, and we look forward to discussing them in detail. As we await your next visit to the United States, please continue to coordinate all matters with my confidant and trusted advisor, James Gilliar. Best regards," and then "R. Hunter Biden."

Do you recall sending this letter?

A I do not recall sending this letter, and I obviously from the email that you've attached, which I appreciate, is that this letter was sent to me, it looks like, right? So someone --

[11:00 a.m.]

BY [redacted]:

Q It appears to be drafted by Rob Walker --

A Someone drafted this letter and sent it to me. And I don't know whether I ever sent this letter to anyone, to the -- to Director Zang or anybody.

Q Based upon the content of this letter, it would appear that there was some work for CEFC prior to the spring of 2017.

Do you recall doing any work for CEFC prior to 2017?

A I do not.

And I don't see -- I disagree with the premise of the question that you just stated. You said it appears that there's work. It says, "We anticipate" -- and this is, by the way, obviously, we've established, this is Rob Walker writing this, not me -- "We anticipate working together on a number of opportunities...." It does not say, "We are working on a number of opportunities."

And I neither do remember signing this or -- and I'm positive that I did not draft this.

Q But it does say, "I believe we have presented a collection of projects...", correct?

A "I believe we have presented a collection of projects that parallel the interests...." Yes, I believe --

Q So do you recall presenting any projects to CEFC in 2016 or 2015?

A I do not personally recall presenting any particular projects. But if James Gilliar or Jonathan -- or, excuse me -- or Rob Walker did, then they very well could have.

Q The chairman of CEFC was Ye Jianming, correct?

A Yes.

Q When did you first meet Ye Jianming?

A I first met Ye Jianming in, I believe, February of 2017 at a meeting in Miami, Florida.

Q And at some point while you were in Miami, Florida, did you receive a diamond from someone at CEFC or Ye Jianming?

A Yes. And, as I'm sure you all travel, and particularly as it relates to the business culture in China, I can say that, when I first received the diamond, I thought it was an extravagant gift, but, at the same time, I know that James, Rob, and myself, who were the attendees of that meeting -- not Tony Bobulinski, by the way -- gave Mr. Ye a magnum bottle of, I think -- I don't know scotch, but -- 1967 Macallan that ultimately was worth far more than the diamond that he gave to us.

Q What did you do with the diamond?

A I gave it to my uncle.

Q Your uncle being James Biden?

A Yeah.

Q Do you know what he did with it?

A I do not know ultimately what he did with it. But I believe that he said he got it checked out and it wasn't really worth much.

Q Did you ever introduce your father to Ye Jianming?

A I do not recall introducing my father to Ye Jianming. But I believe that -- that -- I don't recall that -- any meeting.

Q Rob Walker testified that there was a meeting at the Four Seasons with Ye Jianming, your father, and you were present as well, was his testimony.

A Yeah.

Q You don't recall that?

A What was the date of that meeting?

Q He could not recall the date of the meeting.

A Yeah. And I do not recall the date of the meeting.

And so number one is this: is that my business with CEFC, which was completely legitimate and completely, 100 percent in line with my experience and my abilities, was done when my father wasn't even in office. He was out of office. It had nothing to do with my father.

Q But did your --

A My father never benefited from --

Q -- father meet Ye Jianming?

A Can I finish?

My father never benefited from my business. My father never made any decisions as it related to my business to benefit me. My father was never financially, nor any other way, of benefit from my business.

And the business that you're talking about now wasn't even when he was in office.

Q That's not my question. My --

A Well, what's the purpose --

Q -- question is, did your father meet --

A I'm not --

Q -- Ye Jianming?

A -- I'm not being argumentative. Then what's the purpose? If you want to question my business, if you want to question the business that I do, then we can talk about my business. But what does this have to do with an impeachment inquiry?

Q Your father went, while he was running for President, and said his family never received any money from China. Your father --

A Yes.

Q -- has also said --

A You're right.

Q -- he's never received -- he's never interacted with any of your business associates. Is that correct?

A Yes.

Q But if you introduced him to Ye Jianming, that would be untrue.

A No, that is not untrue. I'm telling you this. The question being asked, that you're stating, is that my father said that I never received any money from China, the Government of China. Unlike Jared Kushner, I've never received money from a foreign government. He --

Q He didn't say Government of China, by the way. He said China.

A From China. Well --

Q Did you receive money from China or not?

A I received money from a Chinese company.

Q How many millions have you received from Chinese companies?

A I don't know the exact amount, but I know that it was all completely legal, it was incredibly ethical.

And I do know this: is that my father never received any money or any benefit from any of the businesses that I've ever done.

Q Let's talk about who did get the benefit.

On March 1st of 2017, State Energy HK Limited, a company called State Energy, deposited $3 million into the Robinson Walker, LLC, account.

Are you aware of that?

A Is State Energy owned by the state of China?

Q You tell me. You worked with them.

A It's not, no.

Q So who do they work for?

A All I know is that, when I went to work with Ye, Mr. Ye, he was the largest independent company inside of China.

The fact of the matter is, is that you can go back and read anything that you want about CEFC during that period of time, and the anomaly of CEFC was this: is that they were not state-owned. They had taken the place of one of the large state-owned entities and had outgrown them.

They were a privately held company. They were privately held by Ye Jianming, who was reported in many different publications as being the wealthiest man in the world because he was the 100-percent equity holder of CEFC, not the state of China.

And that was why I found that it was possible to go into business with somebody that was looking to do one thing, as it related to his relationship with me, was be able to identify natural gas off-take contracts in the United States for export to China through LNG terminals.

And as you all are well aware, I'm certain, of the issues as it relates to our natural gas production, the most difficult piece is that we do not have enough LNG terminals to be able to make those export deliveries, which depresses the price of natural gas in the United States, and we're unable to then put natural gas into places like China, who desperately need it to get off coal. And so --

Q Did Robinson Walker, LLC --

A I'm not finished with my answer.

Q You're filibustering right now. Did --

A I'm not filibustering.

Q -- Robinson Walker, LLC, receive --

A I'm totally answering your question.

Q Did Robinson Walker --

Mr. Nadler. Let him answer the question.

[redacted]. Did Robinson Walker --

Mr. Nadler. Let him answer the question.

[redacted]. Did Robinson Walker, LLC --

Mr. Nadler. Let him answer the question.

[Crosstalk.]

The Witness. -- say that I'm not experienced, that I don't understand, but I'm trying to answer fully --

Mr. Nadler. Let him answer the question.

The Witness. I don't want to be argumentative.

The Reporter. Excuse me. Excuse me. Just one at a time, please.

[redacted]. I have a very pointed question --

The Witness. Sorry.

[redacted]. -- a very pointed question.

The Witness. I apologize.

BY [redacted]:

Q Did Robinson Walker, LLC, on March 1st of 2017, receive a million -- $3 million from State Energy HK Limited?

A Yes, as far as I understand, he did.

Q That money was then disbursed to you and different family members over

the next 2 months, correct?

A What do you mean, "disbursed"?

Mr. Lowell. When you say his "family members" -- sorry. What do you mean by "disbursed," and what do you mean --

[redacted]. After the money hit the --

Mr. Lowell. Let me finish my question to create --

[redacted]. Pause the clock. Pause the clock.

Mr. Lowell. Yes, pause it, but let's have the transcript be as accurate.

At the end of the day, I am sure that, whatever happens, you want a clear transcript of your question and his answer. So, when I ask for a clarification, it's for that purpose.

You just used two phrases, "disbursed" and "family." Can you be more specific?

Put the clock back on.

BY [redacted]:

Q After the money hit the Robinson Walker, LLC, account on March 1st of 2017, over a million dollars goes to EEIG, James Gilliar. Robinson -- Rob Walker retains over a million dollars.

Then, over the following next 2 months, there are over 15 wires that go out to you; to James Biden through JBBSR, Inc.; to Hallie Biden; and other Biden accounts that we're still identifying.

My question to you is, what services did JBBSR, Inc., provide to State Energy HK Limited?

A Okay. Well, I'll start with other Biden accounts that you're continuing to identify. I think that you've had the ability to try to identify those, with your subpoena power. Those are all me.

The million dollars was divided into three ways -- excuse me, the $3 million. It was a retainer agreement with CEFC while we worked out a way in which to become partners through a different entity. And that million dollars that was accredited to me as it related to that, one-third to Rob, one-third to James, went to me -- not my father, not any bank account related to my father.

And what I did is, I said -- like I do with many things that I've done in my business career, is that I wanted my uncle to be an advisor to me, so I sent money to him. I had been using Hallie's American Express card because I did not have a credit card at that time, and so I sent a portion of that money to her for repayment of the American Express bill.

And "other family members," are you talking about the Venmos that I made to my daughters?

Q No. This account had no Venmos.

My question -- the next question to you is, why didn't you --

A But I'm saying, who are the other -- when you say "other" --

Q Why didn't you --

A Okay. I'm just asking --

Q -- receive --

A -- for clarification, [redacted].

Q -- the $1 million into your Owasco PC account or another account instead of sending out individual wires from the Robinson Walker, LLC, account to Hallie Biden and to James Biden?

A A real easy answer: Because, despite the fact that I certainly didn't look like it, is that I sometimes can be oxymoronically cheap. It's to save on two wire transfers.

I knew that I was going to send the money to my uncle. Instead of saying, send it to my account and then I'll figure out how to send it from my Owasco account, business account, another wire transfer to my Uncle Jim or another wire transfer to Hallie, I just said to Rob -- who was, by the way, a friend and an associate of mine for over 20 years -- please just wire it directly to Hallie; please just wire it directly to Uncle Jim. But it's all my money, and it's none to my dad.

Q And it is all your money, but during that time period, were you also going through a divorce?

A I was already divorced by that time. I was divorced in March of 2017 or earlier. But I had been separated from my wife since basically right after my brother died.

Q Were you concerned that if the money went into your Owasco PC account that your ex-wife at that time would know that the money went into your Owasco PC account?

Mr. Lowell. Hold on a second. Hold on. Wait, wait, wait.

The Witness. Okay.

Mr. Lowell. [redacted], on what possible grounds, asking about the relationship between Mr. Biden and his ex-wife, even for the premise of your question, that he was concerned that his ex-wife would find out about it, could possibly be relevant to an impeachment inquiry or an oversight investigation that you announced at the beginning? What is the relevance?

[redacted]. It is relevant to know the purpose of why he's sending wires in a manner that he's sending the wires. We need to know.

Mr. Lowell. And he just answered your question, which had nothing to do with being concerned about anybody --

[redacted]. Which makes no sense, because each wire costs money, so you wouldn't send 15 separate wires. He's saying, I want to send two wires. He ended up sending over 15 wires. If each one cost $25 --

Mr. Lowell. He or Mr. Walker?

The Witness. Mr. Walker. Not me.

[redacted]. That's your business partner. So you ripped off your business partner?

The Witness. No. I'm saying that I didn't double up --

Mr. Swalwell. Oh, come on. Come on.

The Witness. I mean, are you kidding me?

Mr. Nadler. Come on.

The Witness. Look, [redacted], I appreciate the job that you have. I truly do. I appreciate the job that you all have. But I am telling you this: is that if you can show me where any money that I've ever had went to my father, other than, for instance, the repayment of the $1,300 for a loan for a truck -- okay?

Mr. Swalwell. Yeah. Come on.

The Witness. And this is what I'm saying. You want to talk my divorce? I was not hiding money. I can absolutely 100-percent state for the record that in no way was I trying to hide any funds from my wife. And we have a massive settlement divorce that would prove that.

BY [redacted]:

Q Let's talk about --

A Agreement. Excuse me.

Q -- money that went to your father.

You also got, in August of 2017, a $5 million deposit from a company called

Northern International Capital into Hudson West 3, correct?

A I did not -- I did not personally get a $5 million deposit. It went into an LLC, which was a joint venture between my entity, Owasco PC, and Hudson West III and Mr. Ye's personal -- I don't remember -- Hudson West 4, his entity.

And that entity, Hudson West III, of which I did not have control over the bank account, received the $5 million capitalization for the formation of the company that I was just describing to you before you stopped me from finishing describing it.

Q After you get this $5 million deposit into Hudson West III, you get wires into your Owasco PC account, correct?

Mr. Lowell. The "get" in your sentence is not reflecting what he answered.

But you go ahead and answer the next question.

BY [redacted]:

Q You received wires to your Owasco PC account, correct?

A Yes. Wires came into my Owasco PC account based upon the agreement of the joint venture that I had in the capitalization of Hudson West III. Hudson West III was the entity of which I was a member of and was due a certain amount based upon the joint venture agreement in partnership on a monthly basis.

Q And when you would get money, or receive money, into your Owasco PC account that originated from the Northern International Capital, that $5 million that goes into Hudson West III, did you then ever send money to -- wire money to the Lion Hall Group?

A Yes. My uncle was a consultant to Owasco PC on the project that it was related to, in particular, Hudson West III.

Q Just so the record's clear, the Lion Hall Group is associated with your uncle, James Biden. Is --

A Yes.

Q -- that correct? It's also associated with Sara Biden; is that right?

A I don't know the inner workings of Lion Hall, but I know that it's related to my uncle.

Q Are you aware that the money, some of the money, that you transferred from Owasco PC over to the Lion Hall Group did eventually get -- make its way over to your father's account?

A This is the most ridiculous thing that -- I mean, so far. Are you saying to me, do I understand the fungibility of dollars? Do I understand that there is a -- I mean, what is it? Post hoc ergo propter hoc? It's all based upon a fallacy?

I mean, guys, I know this: it is that I was due money from a partnership agreement as it related to the capitalization of an organization which I was working for and on behalf of, that was a Delaware LLC, fully transparently, to build an LNG terminal in Monkey Island in Louisiana that, I believe the estimates were, would create 17,000 jobs, permanent jobs, in Louisiana. That's what I was working towards.

And the person that I was working with towards that end were my partners in Hudson West 3 and my uncle, who I was paying as a consultant to that.

Q I just want to -- you didn't answer the question. Were you aware that that money --

A No. How would I possibly --

Q -- made it over to your father?

A I don't believe that you can possibly say that as being true. I totally disagree with your statement. You're saying that, because I paid my uncle from a Delaware corporation that was fully transparent as to the purpose of that corporation, that had a business partner that happened to be from China, and then that money moved

over into my Owasco PC account, which didn't just have that money but had other money in it, you're acting as if --

Q It had Burisma money, right?

A -- you're acting as if there's, like, a dollar here that somehow was traced all the way down to here to repay a loan that you guys say that my father made to him.

All I know is this: My father was never involved in any of my business, ever. Never received a cent from anybody or never benefited in any way. Never took any actions on behalf in any way.

And I can absolutely, 100 percent state, that is not just in my case but in every family member's case.

Q I want to go back to another question that I asked before regarding your father meeting with Ye.

Was your father at the Four Seasons lunch with Ye Jianming and associates in late February/March of 2017?

Mr. Lowell. You mean other than him saying he doesn't recall that lunch?

The Witness. Yeah, at the --

[redacted]. But does he know it through another source?

The Witness. No, I do not know it through another source. I only know what you are saying to me.

And what I will say is this: is that I -- I do not contest or would question if Rob has a memory. I do not have a memory of the date of that.

And all I know is this: If my father ever met anyone that was related to a business meeting, not just Mr. Ye, anybody -- my dad has been a United States Senator since I was 2 years old. My whole life has been this.

It is impossible -- it's impossible to say, if you are close family and you're around

people, that you would end up meeting -- your children would end up meeting people that you're doing business with, your children would end up meeting people that you are in Congress with, you would be at dinner, you would be in D.C. together, he would walk into --

[redacted]. But it seems like something you would remember.

The Witness. Can you let me finish --

Mr. Lowell. Are you going to let him finish the question?

The Witness. -- because it's important. And I promise you, I'm not trying to obfuscate or -- you can even stop the clock if you want. I'm telling you, is that there is no -- none, zero -- there's no connection whatsoever between my father and my business, period.

[redacted]. This seems like --

The Witness. We can restart the --

[redacted]. -- a very important meeting, with Ye Jianming and your father. It seems like it's something that you would remember at this, sitting here today.

It would be a big meeting. Ye Jianming travels with a big crowd, correct? He has an interpreter, right?

Mr. Lowell. Why are you putting facts in the record of your question?

The Witness. Yes.

Mr. Lowell. He travels with a big entourage? He has an --

[redacted]. I don't know.

Mr. Lowell. Where is that --

[redacted]. I'm trying to refresh his recollection.

[Crosstalk.]

Mr. Raskin. We're over an hour at this point.

[redacted]. You are correct, sir.

Okay. Thank you.

The Witness. Okay. Thank you, guys.

[redacted]. Off the record.

[Recess.]

[redacted]. All right. It is 11:41. We can go back on the record.

[redacted]?

[redacted]. Good morning, Mr. Biden.

Mr. Lowell. Can you speak up, please?

[redacted]. Absolutely.

EXAMINATION

BY [redacted]:

Q I just wanted to go and clear a few things up that my Republican colleagues brought up in their round so that the record is clear about what your testimony is and what the testimony of previous witnesses before this committee has been.

And so I want to start, if you'll let me, with exhibit 4, which my Republican colleagues introduced.

Mr. Lowell. Could you identify which that was? Because I haven't marked --

[redacted]. Yeah --

Mr. Lowell. Never mind, I have it. Thank you. Never mind, I have it. Go ahead.

BY [redacted]:

Q This was two pages produced by Morgan Stanley for an account in the name of "Rosemont Seneca Thornton, LLC, care of Devon Archer."

And I think you testified, Mr. Biden, that you were not on this account; this was

Devon Archer's account.

A Yes.

Q And in response to that, my Republican colleagues introduced exhibit 5, which is another document from Morgan Stanley, trying to suggest that somehow you were involved with this account because this document shows "Rosemont Seneca Partners" on the document. Do you recall that?

A Yes.

Q To be clear, your testimony is, you were not a signatory, you did not have access to this account in the name of Rosemont Seneca Thornton, LLC. Is that correct?

A Yes, that's correct.

Q Well, I would like to introduce exhibit 10.

[Biden Exhibit No. 10
was marked for identification.]

BY [redacted]:

Q This is the actual account application and client agreement, which was also provided to the committee by Morgan Stanley, for this same account. I think you can see the numbers are the same. Do you see that?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And I want you to turn to the last page of it, signatories on the account. And can you read to me all the names that are listed as signatories on this account?

A Devon Archer.

Q That's it?

A That's it.

Q Does it say "Hunter Biden" anywhere?

A No, it does not.

Q So does this document -- that was also produced to the committee by Morgan Stanley, but which my Republican colleagues did not introduce -- show that this account, as you testified, was Devon Archer's account and not your account?

A Yes, that's correct.

Q Next, we discussed -- you discussed with my Republican colleagues the entity Rosemont Seneca Bohai. Do you --

A Yes.

Q -- remember that? And I believe you testified that you had no position with Rosemont Seneca Bohai, that that was Devon Archer's entity.

A Yes.

Q And my Republican colleagues suggested that Devon Archer had testified otherwise. Do you remember that?

A I do.

Q And as exhibit 8, they provided some pages from Devon Archer's transcribed interview transcript. But that did not include page 67 of the transcript. If they had, you would've been able to see the following question propounded by my Republican colleagues during Devon Archer's transcribed interview:

"So you're saying there's no -- he had no -- 'he' being Hunter Biden -- had no position with RSB, Rosemont Seneca Bohai?"

And Devon Archer's response: "Right."

So it seems to me that Devon Archer's testimony and your testimony are the same: You had no position with Rosemont Seneca Bohai. Is that correct?

A That is correct.

Q And then we discussed with my Republican colleagues exhibit 7, the

Rosemont Seneca Bohai account, which was some pages from Morgan Stanley again referring to transactions in the bank account "Rosemont Seneca Bohai, LLC, care of Devon Archer."

And I think your testimony was that you were not a signatory on this account, this was not your account; this was Devon Archer's account. Is that fair?

A That is correct.

Q Okay.

And, again, this was covered in Devon Archer's transcribed interview. Page 16 is not included in the packet that my Republican colleagues introduced as exhibit 8, but if they had, it would show the following exchange.

Question: "And if we look at the top of the page and kind of in the header here, it has 'Rosemont Seneca Bohai, LLC, care of Devon Archer.'"

Response: "Uh-huh."

Question: "Hunter Biden was not on this account, correct?"

Answer: "He was not. He was not on -- no, he was not on the account."

So Devon Archer and your testimony is the same, that you were not on this account.

A That's correct.

Q I just wanted that to be clear so that the record can accurately reflect the documents in the committee's possession and what they show, including bank records, and the testimony that this committee has received and what it says and does not say.

And just so that the record is abundantly clear, all of these entities that we have just talked about -- Rosemont Seneca Bohai, Rosemont Seneca Thornton -- your father had no involvement in any of those entities.

A That is correct; my father had no involvement in any of those entities. And

those entities were not under my control in any way.

Q And your father didn't receive any money from those entities.

A No.

Q Your father certainly never took any official actions on behalf of those entities.

A Absolutely not.

[redacted]. Mr. Biden, just a handful of additional questions, the first one along those lines.

In the prior --

[redacted]. Can we stop for a second?

[redacted]. Sure.

[redacted]. The deposition rules state that there's only one -- allowed one questioner, one staff questioner per round.

[redacted]. So I understand this is a joint deposition --

[redacted]. Right.

[redacted]. -- of the Committee on Oversight and the Committee on the Judiciary, each of which have their own individual rules.

[redacted]. Right.

[redacted]. And so it was our understanding that, as the Oversight rules state one questioner, so the Oversight Committee has one questioner, and the Judiciary rules state one questioner. And so that's what we prepared for.

Had you alerted us ahead of time --

[redacted]. Well, it's the deposition regulation which contemplates joint --

[redacted]. You didn't --

[redacted]. -- joint investigative --

Mr. Raskin. Well, can you -- can you just show us the part in the regulations that specifies that?

[redacted]. Sure.

Mr. Raskin. Because my understanding was that of [redacted] also.

[redacted]. Yeah, it's --

Mr. Lowell. And at the end of the day, may I just ask, does it really matter?

[redacted]. Well --

[redacted]. I don't know that we've actually followed that regulation in the prior depositions, [redacted].

[redacted]. No, we just should do our best to follow the rules.

We also -- I'll also put on the record that we are concerned that there's been content discussed by the Members to reporters, content of the deposition. And that is a violation of rules --

[redacted]. Sorry. How is that relevant to the discussion about who can ask questions?

[redacted]. Well, we just want --

[redacted]. Can we return to that?

[redacted]. -- to alert all Members, like, what the rules are. And if we're going to break the rules, then Republicans might want to go break them too.

Mr. Raskin. [redacted], do you want to show us the language that you're referring to?

[redacted]. Yes. Thank you.

Mr. Swalwell. Abbe, do you care if they ask some questions?

Mr. Lowell. I do not -- hold on.

We don't care whether or not one, two, or six people ask the questions, as long as

it forwards the purpose of this deposition.

Mr. Bishop. Whose rules are they?

[redacted]. It's a House rule.

Mr. Lowell. Say it again?

[Crosstalk.]

The Reporter. Excuse me. Could we just go one at a time, please? Thank you.

Mr. Raskin. [redacted], with your permission, can we proceed as we understood it?

[redacted]. Yeah, it's item -- it's item 5 under the "Regulations for the Use of Deposition Authority."

"A deposition shall be conducted by any member or committee counsel designated by the chair or ranking minority member of the Committee that noticed the deposition. When depositions are conducted by committee counsel, there shall be no more than two committee counsel permitted to question a witness per round."

[redacted]. That would be --

[redacted]. "One" --

[redacted]. That seems to actually --

[redacted]. Just let me finish here.

"One of the committee counsel shall" -- one -- "shall be designated by the chair and the other [designated by] the ranking minority member...."

[redacted]. Certainly, [redacted], and so, therefore, there are two ranking members --

[redacted]. And there's also two -- two deposition notices that went out --

[redacted]. Right.

[redacted]. -- so one was noticed by Chairman Comer, one was noticed by Chairman Jordan -- or, Ranking Member Nadler has actually designated the --

[redacted]. Do we want to just -- okay.

Mr. Raskin. Yeah, [redacted], if you let it go this time, and we can discuss in the future if you guys have a problem --

[redacted]. Well, if that's the plan, then, you know, we would also use two staffers --

Mr. Raskin. And we have no problem with that at all. We understood that it was both Judiciary and Oversight.

[redacted]. And I just want to dispute your account, that we're breaking the rules. This was our reading of the rules. Had you brought up ahead of time that you had a different reading, we would've been happy to hash that out.

[redacted]. Well, honestly --

[redacted]. Okay. I think --

[redacted]. -- I'm not stating you're intentionally, willfully breaking the rule on questioners. The breaking the rules was advising that the Members discussing at the sticks, in between breaks, the content --

[redacted]. And I don't think we want to -- I don't think we want to accept your representation that --

Mr. Goldman. If you're releasing the transcript, then we don't need to go talk --

[redacted]. Yeah.

Mr. Raskin. All right. But I would suggest we resume questioning now under these --

[redacted]. Okay.

[redacted]. Yeah. And I don't think we want to accept your representation --

Mr. Raskin. Let's go forward.

[redacted]. -- of what the Members might have said outside the room, certainly --

Mr. Raskin. We certainly cannot.

[redacted]. -- not on the record, so -- okay.

BY [redacted]:

Q Restarting the clock -- and this will be brief, Mr. Biden.

In the first hour of questioning, you were asked some questions about Kenes Rakishev. Do you remember those questions?

A Yes.

Q To be abundantly clear, your father had nothing to do with any business engagements you might've had with Mr. Rakishev, correct?

A None whatsoever.

Q And your father certainly never received any benefit from any business engagements you might've had with Mr. Rakishev, correct?

A None.

Q Okay.

In the prior hour, you were also asked about a supposed diamond that you were given in Miami. Do you recall those questions?

A Yes.

Q And you started to explain -- and I don't know that you got through your explanation -- that there was a cultural aspect to the exchange of gifts in that scenario.

A Yes.

Q Can you explain what you meant?

A Well, if anyone has been to China, in particular, and other parts of Asia, it's commonplace to exchange gifts at the beginning of any relationship and introduction.

And we brought a, I was told, very expensive, large bottle of vintage -- something or other. And at the end of the meeting, Mr. Ye then presented me with an envelope that contained the diamond that we're talking about.

Q Okay. And you said you gave the diamond to your Uncle Jim?

A Yes.

Q Are you aware that your Uncle Jim had that -- we're calling it a diamond; I'm actually not sure if it was a diamond -- that he had that stone appraised?

A I'm only -- I was not aware, necessarily, at the time exactly how he went about doing that, but he had told me that it was -- it was not worth much --

Q Okay.

A -- or worth anything.

Mr. Roy. Sorry. I'm going to channel Ranking Member Nadler. Could we all --

The Witness. Sorry. I apologize. Yeah.

Mr. Roy. If we could all just speak up a little bit, it's hard to hear.

The Witness. No, I -- I --

Mr. Roy. Including counsel.

The Witness. I ultimately came to learn that it was not of any real value, whatever that means.

BY [redacted]:

Q And I'll represent to you -- or, you're aware that your uncle testified before the committee last week?

A I am aware of that.

Q And I'll represent to you that he had it appraised and that he told the committee it was virtually worthless.

A Okay.

Q And so it's actually probably not even really a diamond, right, if it was -- it was probably just a stone of some kind; is that fair to say?

A I assume. I didn't have any knowledge of the appraiser or could speak to that, but, yes, that it would seem to be the case. I trust my uncle's word at that.

Q And your uncle represented to the committee that he actually threw it away because it had no value.

A Okay. Yeah.

Q And, in contrast to that, you said -- I think in the first hour you said it was a vintage bottle of -- a 1967 bottle of Macallan scotch. Does that sound about right?

A I do, and I don't remember the year or date. I'm not a -- well, I have to be very careful. I'm a drinker -- I was. I'm not any longer. But when I did drink, I did not drink scotch, and so I don't know. But it was purported to me to be a very expensive bottle of -- I was shocked by how much they said. I can't remember exactly.

Q Maybe upwards of $20,000?

A Yes, I think tens of thousands of dollars.

Q Okay.

A Yes.

Q Thank you.

A Yeah.

BY [redacted]:

Q In some comments to the press, there have been comments that there was more than one diamond or more than one stone that you received from the Chinese company.

Did you receive more than this one --

A I don't recall exactly the -- any other gifts, but I don't want to, you know --

Mr. Lowell. I'm sorry. To be clear, you mean, in the envelope that he was given, there was more than one stone? Or --

The Witness. In that one -- no.

[redacted]. In general.

The Witness. Yeah.

[redacted]. Okay.

Do you have anything?

Mr. Raskin. Mr. Biden, you state -- there's a diamond in the rough here -- "I did not involve my father in my business." And you go on to state, that was true as a lawyer, in any of your investments, your transactions, not as a corporate board member, not as an artist, never.

Will you just give us the rationale behind that? Was your father trying to be involved in your businesses and your legal practice and so on and you had to keep him out? Or was it just an assumption both of you had?

The Witness. Yes. I think number one is, it's just a natural family relationship. I was a professional adult and I had my business, and my dad had his business.

But there was one thing that we -- that I was fully aware of my entire life, is that my dad was an official of the United States Government, and there were very bright lines that I abided to and that I was very, very cognizant of. And I made certain that I never engaged with my father in asking him to do anything on my behalf or on behalf of any client of mine.

Mr. Raskin. You've been very honest about your struggle with addiction. It's been made public, perhaps more so than any person I can remember in our time. And we have heard from at least one or two other witnesses that they feel as if some of the political focus on you is an attempt to drive you into a relapse.

And I want to know how you respond to that, whether, you know, you agree with people who are saying that.

And I hope that this process will be conducted, at least from here on in, in a way that is respectful and is dignified. But, in any event, I hope that this is not a process that has driven you outside of your recovery.

The Witness. Yeah, I appreciate that. And I appreciate the question.

It is -- it has not. I'm more determined than I've ever been in my life that the number-one most important thing that I can do, not only for myself but for my family and for those that love and support me, is to maintain my sobriety.

And -- I don't know. I think one of the things that I have not been able to fully comprehend -- I'm speaking to everybody at the table here -- is at least the understanding of that, at least the understanding of the fact that I am certain every single person in this room has had someone in their life that they love, if not themselves, if not personally themselves, that have been the victims of the disease of addiction. And I don't consider myself a victim, but I do know this: is that it's real, and it rips apart families, it rips apart communities.

It's something that I am -- I know, for me, if I have a purpose in life now, that purpose in life is to be an example to other people that I know that have it a hell of a lot harder than I do, even in these circumstances.

It's one thing to have to come and face all of you, and that's intimidating, and I can tell you, it fills me with anxiety on a daily basis, but I know this: There are people out there that -- that don't have families that love and support them anymore. There are people out there that don't, from the outside, look like they have any hope at all.

And all I can say is this: is that the one thing that I would hope that you would respect is that struggle, if not for me, at least for the people that are your constituents

that are facing the same thing.

And I'm not being saccharine or I'm not being disingenuous, and I promise you I'm not in any way saying this other than for this: Everyone -- everyone -- has dealt with this in one way or another.

And I have to make my amends, and I made mistakes, and I screwed up. I know that. The world knows that now. The world knows that a thousand times over now. But I do know this: is that, at least when you talk about it, give me that benefit, give your constituents that benefit, give the people of America that benefit.

Over 35 million Americans right now are suffering from addiction, and it's a disease that takes lives every day. And you know it. You watch it. And they are not evil. They are not bad people. It doesn't stop some of them from being bad or evil, and they have to pay for what they've done, if they've done something in addiction that they should not have done. And that's my responsibility.

But I can tell you this: The only involvement of my father in anything in my life has been as my father, not as a business partner, not as a benefit of my business, not anything.

But I would just hope that you would respect what everyone else is going through and realize it's not just about me when you speak about the things that I've faced as it relates to -- and some of those behaviors in my darkest days.

Mr. Raskin. Thank you, Mr. Biden.

No further questions.

[redacted]. We can go off the record. Thank you.

[Recess.]

[redacted]. We'll go back on the record.

BY [redacted]:

Q We just pulled a part of the exhibit, the deposition transcript -- or a transcribed interview transcript of Rob Walker that we were discussing at the end of the first majority hour, regarding -- I'll refer you to line 15.

Mr. Jordan asked Mr. Walker: "And describe for us again -- we got into this right at the tail end of our first hour. Describe who was all there."

And this is a luncheon at the Four Seasons involving some of the CEFC officials.

Mr. Lowell. Can you date that, just for the record? Which is this, which luncheon? 2000-when?

[redacted]. '17.

Mr. Lowell. Okay.

[redacted]. We believe it was in February or March of 2017.

[redacted]. And, Mr. Biden, you had asked [redacted] the relevance. And --

Mr. Lowell. No, I asked the question. And he did too.

[redacted]. I think he did as well.

And some of the testimony we received and some of the documents indicate that the CEFC business deals were, in fact, going on during the year 2016.

And so, to the extent your father, the former Vice President, stopped by a luncheon in early 2017, you know, we're simply just, you know, asking the question, whether that was something that was planned. I'm trying to refresh your recollection at all about that luncheon where your dad stopped by.

Mr. Lowell. Allegedly.

The Witness. Yeah.

Number one, as I said before, I do not recall -- I do not recall this, but I don't question Mr. Walker's memory of it.

However, if he did stop by, it was in 2017, when he was out of office. And --

[redacted]. Correct.

The Witness. -- I understand that your question is -- well, I guess I don't understand your question. What's the --

BY [redacted]:

Q Well, I'm presenting you the transcript to see if it refreshes your recollection at all. Just want to talk a little bit about it a little bit more --

A Sure.

Q -- because I think we started with just a minute left on the clock in the first hour.

A Yes. I do not recall him specifically being there. However, again, I don't question Rob's memory of it, if he says that that occurred.

If it occurred, it occurred in -- I think he says here when it occurred was in early 2017 sometime. I know that the first time that I ever met Chairman Ye was in February of 2017. So, if this did occur, it had to have happened after that.

Q Okay. And do you recall any conversations with the CEFC officials about your dad?

A No.

Q Okay. And so it was never part of the plan that your dad would stop at the lunch or be part of the business at all?

A No.

Q How many -- do you remember any luncheons at the Four Seasons that involved Chairman Ye and the CEFC officials?

A I do not.

Q Okay. So, to the best of your recollection, you can't remember ever being at the Four Seasons with CEFC officials?

A Again, I don't even know, are they -- what Four Seasons are they talking about, first of all?

Q The one in Washington, D.C.

A Oh, in Washington, D.C.

Q Yeah.

A No. I mean, I know that I've had lunch at the Four Seasons a number of times. I don't ever remember having lunch with Chairman -- with Mr. Ye at the Four Seasons in which my father stopped by.

But, again, I'm telling you, I don't contest Rob's memory of it. If Rob is certain of that, then it most likely happened.

Q Okay.

We talked about the Cafe Milano, I think two dinners at Cafe Milano. One was in early February, as I understand it, and one was later on in the spring.

Mr. Lowell. What year?

[redacted]. 2014.

And '15? The second one was in 2015?

Okay. So one was in February of 2014; the second one was in the spring of 2015.

BY [redacted]:

Q Do you remember your dad being involved with Cafe Milano dinners?

A No. Again, I had many dinners at Cafe Milano. Many of them were social. Many of them were family. Many of them were a combination of social, family, and business.

And so it would not be rare for my dad to call me and say, what are you doing, because between the White House and the Vice President's residence, literally, Cafe Milano is kind of equidistant. It's, from the back gate -- there's a back gate --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- to the VP's residence. And if my mom wasn't there or if my mom was home in Delaware, he would, you know, stop and have a bowl of spaghetti with me or whoever I was sitting with.

Q Okay. How often did your dad do that? Like, how many times do you remember that happening?

A I can't count the number of times my dad stopped to have dinner with me and my family. He would stop over at my house and have dinner with me and my children.

Q No, but when you were conducting some business.

A Well, I wasn't conducting business when I had those meetings, necessarily. I was -- number one, I had a dinner for the U.S. -- U.N. World Food Programme.

Q Uh-huh.

A It didn't have anything to do with business. Each person around that table, individually and collectively, had the opportunity and the ability to actually do something in support of the U.S. -- or, excuse me, the U.N. World Food Programme. And we made a presentation at that one dinner that I'm talking about.

I think another dinner you're talking about was actually on my actual birthday, and my dad stopped by because it was my actual birthday.

Q And do you remember anything specific from the February 4th? You testified this morning about the World Food Programme Cafe Milano dinner. What do you remember about the birthday dinner in February --

A Well, here's what I remember, and to be very clear, is that it was my birthday, and the reason my dad stopped by was because it was my birthday. That's it.

Q Do you remember who was there?

A I don't remember exactly who was there because it's sometimes conflated by both you guys and sometimes by myself. I'm not --

Q Okay.

A -- I'm not saying to you of who was at -- you know, what individuals were at each meeting. I have not seen a guest list of both of them, as we talked about, a specific guest list --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- but I know that they were associates and people that were in town, and I know that Devon was at both of them.

Q Okay.

A Yeah.

Q Do you think some of your business associates that we've spoken about today -- Mr. Archer, Mr. Bobulinski, Mr. Galanis -- do you think they had an expectation that your dad had any role or involvement with any of your joint business dealings?

A Not an expectation from me.

And I think that you'd see in my communications to them, there was never a single time that I can remember in which I say, "Hey, we'll get my dad involved," "Hey, let's get my dad on the phone," "Hey, you know, let's -- you know, what can we get from my dad out of this?"

Q Uh-huh.

A Is that I am absolutely certain is that anytime that I am talking about my family in any of those communications, it is to make certain that people know that it's my family and it's not theirs. It's not their name to screw up; it's mine.

And so I am certain that if any of their -- any of the -- their expectations would not derive from me.

Q Uh-huh. I mean, you've said yourself, I believe to ABC, that the reason you were picked for the Burisma board was because you're a Biden.

A I didn't say that. I didn't -- I -- I -- again, what I said, just to be clear, if you'd like to read the actual quote -- but what I think I said, and I will paraphrase, is that, in my entire life, it's a commonplace name.

It is -- my dad -- I live in a State that has 900,000 people. You know, when I got pulled over when I was a kid for speeding, the cop wouldn't let me go. He'd say, "Your dad's going to kick your ass" and laugh about it. And that's what would happen.

And so, for me, I've always had the last name "Biden," and it's been something that has been both an incredible -- number one --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- more than anything, an incredible honor, and it's been a -- and it's also an incredible responsibility.

And as I said before, I screwed that up when I was -- when I had addict- -- when I was in the darkest days of my life and when I lost my brother and ended up with a divorce and everything fell apart.

And -- but the one thing that I am absolutely aware of is that -- cognizant of the fact that, when people engage with me, is that, are they engaging with me because of my skills -- like, for instance, you guys have gone out and said I had no credibility, no -- that there's no way that I should've been serving on the board of Burisma. I just read you my resume. I'd put my resume up against any one of you, in terms of my responsibility. I don't know anybody that was -- at that time that was teaching the number one-rated course at Georgetown's School of Foreign Service in the master's program in terms of foreign policy and advocacy. I literally was on 17 -- like, 12 different boards. I only listed like, you know, 10 of them. And so I had an enormous amount of reasons to be on

it.

So, when I say -- I'm always cognizant of the fact that there is -- in many instances, somebody may have an ulterior notion. And it's my job to be able to balance that and to create boundaries.

Q Uh-huh.

Mr. Archer testified about the brand, the Biden brand, and that was, you know, an asset for your joint business activities, that --

A Yes. And, you know, here's the thing. Here's the way that I think about the brand. The brand is this: is my dad, with the support of his family -- in particular, my mom; my Aunt Valerie, who's run every one of his campaigns; my grandparents; everyone -- it's their legacy. Primarily, the name "Biden" is my dad's legacy. And he passes it down to me and, when my brother was alive, my brother, my sister, now to my children.

It's our responsibility to not screw that up. It's to live to what I think is the person that I hold in the highest regard of any human I've ever met in my life, is my dad.

And, to that end, is that, whenever I -- I don't remember any times I talked about it as a brand, but that's my view of the brand. If other people saw the brand as something that they could market, it's not -- it was not with my -- without going through me first. And if they did so, they didn't go through me first.

Q Is it fair to say, though, that Burisma wanted you on your their board because your dad was the Vice President?

A No, I don't think that it's fair. Again, [redacted], I really don't. I really don't think that it's fair to say that -- for that to be the entire sentence.

I can say to you this: I know why President Kwasniewski of Poland wanted me to be on the board. He is the one who convinced me, ultimately, to be on the board.

He's one of the first democratically elected Presidents of Poland.

He called me up and he told me this. He said, if people in the West do not stand up against Vladimir Putin and Vladimir Putin's aggression and they allow for companies like Burisma -- whatever you think about Burisma, it was a bulwark against Russian aggression in a moment in time when the single purpose of Vladimir Putin, in his taking Crimea and his incursions into Donetsk and to Donbas, was to take over the natural-gas fields, was to take over their energy supply.

And that still remains the single biggest goal. Ukraine is not necessarily for the people; it's for their natural resources. It's for a pipeline to the West. It's to be able to choke off Europe. That's what it's for.

And there was two gas companies inside of Ukraine at that time. One of them was the state-owned, which was highly corrupt and connected to people like Firtash, which was directly going into Vladimir Putin's pocket. The only independent company was Burisma. And Burisma was supplying 60 percent of all natural gas to power the entire industry in Ukraine, including 78 percent of all steel mills. And so they needed to survive.

And President Kwasniewski said to me, if that is -- ends up being the result, if it shows that me, President Kwasniewski, who is literally the symbol of democracy in Eastern Europe, and you, Hunter Biden, whose name is also a symbol of freedom and democracy and standing up for the Ukrainians' desire for a democratic state against Vladimir Putin, then I was comfortable with that. I was completely comfortable with that.

Q Who's Alex Kotlarsky?

A Alex Kotlarsky was an associate of Devon's. They worked together. He had a separate company in which he introduced Devon -- I believe he introduced Devon

to Burisma originally.

Q And what was his role in getting you a board seat at Burisma?

A That's -- he introduced Devon to the CEO of Burisma.

Q Okay. And, as I understand it, you had to pay a finder's fee to Mr. Kotlarsky?

A Yes.

Q And what was that finder's fee?

A I don't remember the exact figure, but if you have a document. I don't know if it was a third or -- I think it was around that.

Q Okay. Do you remember your annual salary with Burisma?

A I think that it worked out to be about $65,000 per month over 5 years.

[12:21 p.m.]

BY [redacted]:

Q Okay. And do you know if your salary changed when your father was no longer the Vice President?

A My salary changed when all the board members' salaries were renegotiated. Devon was taken off of the board because of an issue that he had legally, and then they renegotiated all the salaries of board members.

Q And do you know what timeframe that was?

A I don't know exactly when it was. I think it was some time in -- after Devon's indictment, soon after Devon's indictment.

Q Do you remember what year that was?

A 2017, I believe.

Q Okay. So that was --

A I think he was indicted in late 2016 and, yeah, into '17.

Q And what can you tell us about Vadym Pozharsky?

A Vadym Pozharsky was an employee at Burisma. He was, I think, officially kind of secretary to the board.

Q Okay. Was he your go-between? Was he the person you interfaced with?

A Well, Vadym spoke English. Mykola and most -- and some of the managers did not speak English. All of the board members spoke English, every single one of them. We conducted board meetings in English, and it was translated into Russian or Ukrainian for the purposes of Mykola or some of the managers.

Most of the people are the engineers who worked for Burisma were also all Americans that actually did the drilling and had the prospects of the drilling. So their

lawyer, their accountant, everybody spoke English.

Q What types of services did you provide on the board? I mean, you were making a million a year, Burisma. What were you doing for that million?

A Well, I don't think ultimately it worked out to be that but I -- what I was doing is I was the head of the corporate governance, corporate governance.

And my responsibilities were like any other board member, to attend board meetings, to be aware of what the management was doing to try to strive for, you know, accountability, transparency, openness in terms of the reporting, to go through the financials and make certain that the financials were certified by a CPA.

The whole idea was that it was a private company that was operating in Ukraine for a very long period of time in that part of the world, which doesn't have the same high standards that the West does. And that was my goal in trying to provide a more Western-looking and acting company.

Q How many hours a month do you think you spent on the Burisma work?

A I don't know.

Q Or your work?

A I didn't keep hours, but we spent a good deal of time.

Q Was it a full-time job?

A I don't think it was a -- no, it was not a full-time job. It was a board member seat like anybody, a board member sits. I don't think anybody who takes a board member seat takes it as a full-time job. It wasn't employment. It was a board position.

Q Okay. But it wasn't a full-time salary. I mean, a million bucks a year is a --

A Oh, yeah.

Q -- pretty good gig.

A Look, I don't have any -- I'm absolutely certain that it was a lot of money. And I don't think, though, that it stands out necessarily from anybody that was working on a board of a Fortune 500 company that is similar in size here in the United States, that receives a board fee, along with stock options. I think actually the truth of the matter is, is it's right in line with that.

Q Were you aware at the time that your father had a specific role involving Ukraine policy as Vice President?

A I was aware, number one, is that -- is this, is that my father had a specific -- a very unique role as Vice President of the United States, unlike any other Vice President, except for probably Vice President Cheney. He did not take a specific set of issues and stick to those specific set of issues.

One of the -- he writes about it and has spoken about it in terms of his relationship with President Obama is that he would not be -- serve simply to, for instance, be the ambassador as it relates to the climate or to one country.

And so one of the roles that my dad had, I'm absolutely certain, was dealt with Russian aggression, which obviously proves Ukraine.

Q There was some testimony back in 2019. George Kent, a State Department official --

A Yes.

Q -- testified that there were some concerns that your involvement with the Burisma board may have presented a conflict for the Vice President.

Mr. Lowell. Wait, I'm sorry.

Mr. Kent said that to Mr. Biden?

[redacted]. Mr. Kent testified --

Mr. Lowell. That's not what I'm asking. You're saying that at some point,

Mr. Kent made a statement that he, Mr. Kent, felt something and your testimony -- your question is did he ever convey that to Mr. Biden.

[redacted]. Well, that's what I'm getting ready to ask.

Mr. Lowell. Okay. Please.

BY [redacted]:

Q Mr. Kent testified that he had some concern and other State Department officials had some concern that perhaps your board membership with Burisma presented a conflict. And they wrestled with how do we -- how do we raise this to the Vice President's office? And ultimately, I believe they sent some emails, and Amos Hochstein had a one-on-one conversation with your dad about this.

And so my question for you is: What was your thinking about that question, about the ethics question?

A I appreciate the question. But just -- I don't agree necessarily with the way that you presented -- I appreciate your question.

I don't necessarily agree with the way you present that question, is that I don't know, for instance, if Mr. Kent said that they expressed that there was a conflict or whether he expressed that there -- that the appearance of a conflict could take place. I think that's an important distinction.

And in terms of whether it was ever related to me, it was not related to me by anybody in an official capacity.

Amos Hochstein and I have been friends since I first met him in 2007, traveling around Iowa. He worked for Senator Dodd at that time. And I was there, campaigning on behalf of my dad. I lived in Iowa for 7 months in motels.

And Amos and I would see each other often at these events where we would either speak on behalf of the candidate or run into each other, and he has been a close,

personal friend.

The time that I saw Amos, I asked him. I was getting an enormous amount of incoming, I would say, from the media about, you know, my role in Burisma. I was very transparent about it. You can all recall, remember, this was not -- I did not try to hide this. I sent out a press release the day that I joined the board.

And I thought that I was able to, like, withstand it because of what I said about the reasons that I wanted to join the board.

And I asked Amos to -- if he would meet me for coffee. We met at Georgetown as place that we -- that I -- that I know he would go to. I would sometimes see him coming out when I was going in. So we met there at a table.

And the first thing that we talked about over the course of the time was my family, my brother, and what had just -- Beau had just died a few months earlier, I believe, at this time. And we talked about that.

And I talked about the stress and the strains that were being put on the entire family because of it. It was nothing unique for any family, but it was devastating.

And then I asked Amos, I said, do you have any advice for me about how I should handle what was very public at the time. It was kind of, you know, an open secret. And I knew Amos had an enormous amount of understanding of the area.

And Amos said to me, Amos said to me, you know, he said any -- the -- that you have to worry about, Hunter, as it relates to this, is the ability -- you have no understanding of the Russian disinformation and the way in which they could potentially weaponize this. He said, So you need to be really careful.

And that was the extent of it.

Q Do you know if he had any conversations with your father about that?

A I don't know if he had any conversations with -- I know that he testified here,

but I haven't seen that testimony.

Q Mr. Zlochevsky, at the time, was under investigation from a number of fronts. Isn't that correct?

A Well, not at the time that I -- as I understood it, when I joined the board.

So just to get the timeline right here is, when I was first introduced to Burisma as an organization and Mr. Zlochevsky as the leader of that organization, I was introduced by Devon.

Devon said that they, you know, had a whole host of issues, and I was at -- of counsel at Boies Schiller Flexner. And I said, well, if they would like to talk to me, they can talk to me, because I know there that are people with experience at Boies Schiller Flexner that can also be helpful.

And so they became a client of mine initially at Boies Schiller Flexner. And in that time I asked them, because I wanted to do a background and security check on them to make certain that they are who they say they were. And they provided me with a Kroll report.

I don't -- I can't speak about what I did for them necessarily. But in that Kroll report and in a subsequent report that was commissioned by Burisma, it did not have any of the allegations as it relates to the -- what eventually happened in the U.K. and then eventually was dismissed in the U.K.

And so that -- that's the answer, I think, to your question.

Q Do you recall a December 2015 board meeting in Dubai?

A I do. I believe that that was the date of the board meeting in Dubai.

Q So December 4th, 2015, there was a board meeting in Dubai. Do you remember at that board meeting whether Mr. Zlochevsky, or any of the Burisma officials, raised concerns about the pressure he was under from some of these investigations?

A I know that there -- I'm certain they talked about pressure in general. The pressure was enormous from all sides --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- for Burisma. They were literally every inch of territory that Putin was encroaching into Ukraine was a potential loss for them and loss for Ukraine in terms of their ability to produce natural gas and run a large portion of the factories, and so, in terms of those pressures.

Now there was also, obviously, you know, there's the geopolitical pressures that were occurring inside Ukraine, which obviously would affect the company and an individual like Mr. Zlochevsky.

Q But Mr. Zlochevsky, at the time, was under investigation by the prosecutor general in Ukraine, Mr. Shokin.

A In 2015? No, that's the exact opposite of the truth. And I think you can go to, I don't know, maybe 15,000 public reports. And you can talk to the IMF, and you can talk to the -- you can talk to the World Bank. And you can talk to the EU, the EU Commission on Energy and the EU Commission as it related to democracy.

And you can talk to the State Department, or any State Department official that testified before your committee, Mr. Jordan, or when you were impeachment. And they can say the exact opposite.

Mr. Zlochevsky was not investigating the -- many of the oligarchs, including a company like Burisma at that time.

Q How about Ambassador Pyatt? What do you think he would have said?

A Ambassador Pyatt actually gave a speech at the time after I joined the board in December of 2019, criticizing Mr. Shokin for not investigating, in particular, Burisma.

Q But Mr. Pyatt also gave a speech where he was very critical of Burisma. Do

you remember that?

A That's what I'm saying. When he was critical of, he was critical of Burisma and he was in the context of Shokin was not doing his job.

So I guess the most important point that I'd like to add and for once and for all here is that we can all agree is that there is not a single person other than Alexander Smirnov who says that Shokin, that Shokin was fired because I was on the board of Burisma.

It's literally the exact opposite, and that has been a fact now since it was first claimed. It is a fact. I'm telling you. It is a fact.

And I would really like you all to either look at -- look at every single report that's out there. Look at what Mr. -- President Poroshenko said. President Poroshenko, Viktor Shokin is the godfather to his child.

President Poroshenko came out against Viktor Shokin and said everything he said is a lie. It's the exact opposite was true. Godson to his child, he went on national television here in the United States and said everything is a lie.

Every single other official inside of -- Viktor Shokin was prosecuted inside of -- inside Ukraine because he was found with cash and diamonds and his Chief of Staff, who he was formerly his driver, were both prosecuted. And so Viktor Shokin was the problem, and the entire world community was asking for his removal.

Q So Burisma wanted Viktor Shokin removed so --

A I don't know. I never involved me in any of that. I didn't have any discussions whatsoever about Viktor Shokin. It was not a -- on my radar at the time. I had no involvement.

But the one thing also to make absolutely clear is I never spoke to my dad about it. Never had any discussions with him about it, because the only honest -- the only thing

that would be of value here would be for Viktor Shokin to stay in place, not the opposite.

Q At that December 2015 board meeting, it's been reported that you broke away with Mr. Pozharsky to call your dad.

A No, I didn't know that that was reported.

Mr. Lowell. Wait, wait.

The Witness. Yeah.

Mr. Lowell. Can I see the report?

[redacted]. It's the Devon Archer transcript.

Mr. Lowell. Okay. So it hasn't been reported. You're now stating something Mr. Archer said.

[redacted]. Correct.

Mr. Lowell. Okay. Now can you --

[redacted]. I think that's been reported that Mr. Archer --

Mr. Lowell. Got it. Okay.

[redacted]. I was trying not to make an issue between you and Mr. Archer.

The Witness. No, no, I don't have -- can I see exactly what Devon said?

BY [redacted]:

Q Yeah.

A Let me ask you --

Q Page 35, 36.

A Let me ask you before I see it. Did Devon say that I stepped away with Mr. Pozharsky specifically to call my dad? That's his exact words?

Q I believe that's his testimony.

A Okay, let's --

Mr. Lowell. I think not.

The Witness. But we can look at it.

Mr. Lowell. Let's read the entire thing. Okay?

The Witness. If you guys can pull --

BY [redacted]:

Q Page 35, 36.

A And I can answer you this is that that never happened.

Q Okay.

A 100 percent never happened. I never called my dad --

Q I mean, if that's your testimony, then we don't --

A Yeah, but let's read it, though.

Q We don't --

A I want to read it just to make certain.

Mr. Lowell. Why don't we read into the record the question and answer so that we can have an accurate statement of what it is he said, please.

[redacted]. Of course.

The Witness. I found it if you want me to --

Mr. Lowell. Go ahead. Why don't you read it?

The Witness. Okay. So it says, question, What did -- start at number 15 or number 16, or number 14 here on this, on page 36.

What did Hunter Biden do after he was given that request?

This is your question, [redacted].

And Devon says: Listen, I did not hear this phone call but he -- he called his dad.

Question: How do you know that?

Answer: Because he, because I think Vadym told me. But again, it's unclear. I just know that there was a call that happened there. I was not privy to it.

What did Vadym tell you about the call?

Answer: Just that -- just that we called D.C., but he didn't know, you know. Again, it's not like -- there was not a -- there was not, Oh, we've got all our problems solved kind of revelation. I was -- I was not on the side of the equation, kind of working in the lobbying side of the business.

And my point is, is that, number one, this is Devon talking about a call that I made to D.C. And I never would have called, and never did my father on behalf of Burisma with Vadym Pozharsky to ask for anything. It never happened.

BY [redacted]:

Q Okay. Who did you call?

A I don't -- have no idea whether there call ever took place. I have no recollection of a call --

Q Okay.

A -- that was over 10 years ag go from a -- from, you know, in which, I called D.C.

If I called D.C., most likely I called back to my office. Most likely I called back to my -- my wife. Most likely I called back to one of my daughters who were in high school. But that's who I would call.

I wouldn't, in any way ever, you know, call my dad to get him to do something that is business, which I think is obv -- is made, you know, clear by the evidence.

Q Okay. Is it possible you called Secretary Blinken?

A No.

Q Future Secretary Blinken?

A Absolutely not possible I called Secretary Blinken at that time.

Q Okay. Are you familiar with Blue Star Strategies and when they became a

consultant for Burisma?

A Yes, I am.

Q And how did that arrangement become initiated?

A Karen and -- Karen Tramontano and Sally Painter were the two principles of Blue Star Strategies. Karen and Sally had a long relationship with Eric Schwerin and they were -- they had a consulting group in D.C.

Some of the things that -- that Burisma, understandably and credibly, needed in terms of services I was not willing to provide. One of those things were do any work as it related to visas that they needed.

Number one, I don't have that expertise.

Number two, I'd never pick up the phone and call anybody for a visa.

And, number three, the chances of, even if it was the Vice President's son of the United States, the Department of Homeland Security is no more going to grant a visa because I asked them to or anybody than, you know, fly to the moon.

And so, there were things that they needed done, and some of those things were outside of my scope of work that I absolutely would not do.

And so, I asked Eric if they knew of anybody that they could hire, and he suggested Karen and Sally, who I knew just socially and tangentially a few times. And I trusted them implicitly. I thought their work was -- that they were good people and they knew what they were talking about.

Q And so they were hired by Burisma?

A Yes, they were hired by Burisma.

Q And do you know what their assignment was?

A I don't know what their assignment was, but it would deal with things that would relate to any communications with government entities and things like that.

Q Were you involved with setting up the arrangement?

A No, there was one time in which I believe that I passed a number along to, as it related to the State Department. But there was never any time in which I involved myself in any of their communications other than to make sure a connection was made.

[redacted]. Okay. Mark the next exhibit.

We're up to number 12.

[Biden Exhibit No. 12
was marked for identification.]

BY [redacted]:

Q This is an email chain that was initially disclosed by the IRS on Special Agents who came to Congress.

A Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

Q So the chain begins on the second page of this document.

A Yeah.

Q And a Blue Star staffer is passing along to Mr. Archer a revised proposal --

A Yep.

Q -- which gets to Mr. Pozharsky, yourself, and --

Mr. Lowell. I'm sorry. To be accurate, can we do that again? You said it starts on the second page where this person named Lindgren sends something to Mr. Archer --

[redacted]. Correct.

Mr. Lowell. -- Ms. Painter and not Mr. Biden.

[redacted]. Okay.

Mr. Lowell. I just want to make clear because you said it starts on the second page.

[redacted]. Well, what I'm -- I'm sort of introducing my questions.

Mr. Lowell. Okay. Go ahead.

BY [redacted]:

Q Mr. Pozharsky responds to Mr. Archer. You are cc'd on the next email in the chain, which is at the bottom first page. Mr. Pozharsky takes issue at the Blue Star proposal.

Mr. Pozharsky says in the second line, "The first thing is the suggested scope of work is largely lacking concrete tangible results that we set out to achieve in the first place, mostly focusing on the process.

"Also, it doesn't offer any names of top U.S. officials here in Ukraine or Ukrainian officials as key targets for improving Mykola's case and his situation in Ukraine."

Flipping over to the second page.

"If, however, this is done deliberately to be on the safe and cautious side, I can understand the rationale. And if all parties, in fact, understand the true purpose of the BS engagement and all our joint efforts, it's okay, and we should proceed immediately."

A Yeah.

Q And so, my question to you is: What was your understanding at that time of improving Nikolay's case?

A I didn't have any understanding of that. This is -- this email, just to be clear, is about the contract that Blue Star negotiated with Burisma. That's it. That's what he's talking about, the scope of the -- of their work, not my work. It's just simply talking about Blue Star which is a global consulting company that deals in these issues for both foreign and domestic companies were doing.

Q Understood. But Mr. Pozharsky's emailing you and Mr. Archer.

A No, no, no, no, no, no. Just to be clear, he's not just emailing me and Mr. Archer. He's emailing -- it says, "Dear Colleagues."

Q Uh-huh.

A It's the, I believe, the entirety of the board that he's probably emailing. If it's not, I'm cc'd. Most likely I'm bcc'd. So the colleagues that would go to is, what he's doing is distributing. These documents are the contract that's there.

Q Okay.

A And I don't respond to it in any way.

Q Okay. Given the understanding of what Mr. Pozharsky meant by the true purpose of the BS engagement?

A No, I have no idea.

Q Okay.

A Well, again, just remember also is this is that you have a -- someone that is using probably Google Translate in half the communications that they're doing to me.

But I don't -- I don't see anything that varies in that when I look at it right now.

Q Okay.

A But I do know that it's about Blue Star. It's not about me. It's not about me or any involvement of my father.

Q Mr. Schwerin responds, and he suggests, "I would tell Vadym that it's definitely done deliberately."

A Uh-huh.

Q Do you know what that refers to?

A Again, I don't know. I'm not a part of -- actually I'm neither responding to this --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- nor am I the author of the original one that I was not on. So I can't say for certain what exactly he's talking about, but I assume that it's about the scope of

work --

Q Yeah, I think --

A -- that they're talking about.

Q -- you may not be on that message but Mr. Archer forwards it to you.

A I see that, yes. At the top where he forwards it, "Hunter, you need to deliver that message," I don't respond that I know of.

Q And Mr. Archer says, "I've walked this to the finish."

And so my question is: What -- if you know, what was the message Mr. Archer wanted you to deliver?

A That they needed to hire Blue Star Strategies.

Q "And I have walked us to the finish line but need some support to close."

What was the issue?

A That they needed to hire Blue Star Strategies. That's it.

Q But why? Why that was so important?

A Because they had issues that I -- neither myself or -- just myself, that I knew that I would have no part of. Their expectations needed to be set clearly. They needed a consulting company in order for them to be able to approach anybody in the United States Government that was not me or anybody associated with me.

Q Was that the plan? They, Burisma needed help approaching officials in the U.S. Government?

A No, I didn't say that it was surely the U.S. Government. I don't know.

All I know is this, is that they had issues. They had issues related to visas. They had other issues. They were a global company under attack from Vladimir Putin.

And so I wanted to make it absolutely clear. A lot of their issues remained in Ukraine and other places in that region of the world. And Sally and Karen were

well-suited to be able to deal with those. That was their job. That was their business. That was their 35 years of experience.

[redacted]. Okay. I'll mark the next exhibit --

Mr. Gaetz. Hold on. Before we leave this, [redacted], Mr. Biden, do you recall receiving this message from Mr. Archer?

The Witness. Do I -- I see it in front of me.

Mr. Gaetz. No, I'm saying when it was sent to you, do you -- as you're now reading it, do you recall having received it at the time?

The Witness. It's 9 years ago.

Mr. Gaetz. Will you answer my question?

The Witness. I'm sorry, Congressman.

[redacted]. I'm going to introduce another exhibit that might refresh his recollection.

The Witness. Let me see. Do I remember receiving this particular email on this particular moment in time? I cannot say that I recall the exact moment when I would have received this email, but I do not contest that this was an email to me.

[redacted]. So the next exhibit -- what number?

[redacted]. 13.

[Biden Exhibit No. 13
was marked for identification.]

BY [redacted]:

Q Is number 13. It's on the same topic. You respond to Vadym's message, the "Dear Colleagues" message. This is on the first page I'm referring you to.

And you email, "Let me have one final call with them and verify once more that they understand the scope so we can all feel that the retainer is in line with the work

required."

A Yes.

Q So how many calls do you believe you had with Ms. Painter or Ms. Tramontano?

A Well, I guess I had one final call. Whether I had a call before that, I can't say for certain. And what I -- I stand by. Am I being asked whether -- how many calls that I had?

Q Yeah, that's my question.

A I don't know how many calls that I had with them. I assume that I had one final call with them.

Q Okay. It seems like you were following up on Mr. Archer's advice to try to close this deal. Is that fair?

A I don't know whether -- what the reason was but I -- I was in favor of Burisma hiring Blue Star Strategies.

Q And in the engagement process before Blue Star was engaged, do you specifically remember telephone calls with Ms. Tramontano and Ms. Painter?

A No, I don't.

Q Do you remember any communications with Ms. Tramontano and Ms. Painter about --

A Not directly.

Q -- Burisma?

A No, I don't.

Q Or did you go through Mr. Schwerin?

A I don't know whether I would say I went through Mr. Schwerin. Mr. Schwerin had his own relationship with them, and I trusted him implicitly when he

would communicate with them.

Mr. Lowell. Speak up.

The Witness. Yeah, sorry.

[redacted]. Tab 14.

BY [redacted]:

Q So do you know if Blue Star had been specifically working on improving Mykola's case with Ukrainian officials or U.S. officials or any officials?

A I have no idea. I don't -- I don't recall in any way exactly what they were working on at this time.

Q Do you remember at that time in 2015 that Ambassador Pyatt had been critical of Burisma?

A I only remember because it was, I think, reported in most major U.S. newspapers.

Q At the time you were on the board, did your Burisma colleagues mention anything to you about their concern about Mr. -- Ambassador Pyatt's comments?

A No.

[Biden Exhibit No. 14
was marked for identification.]

[redacted]. Marked exhibit 14.

The Witness. Not that I recall.

BY [redacted]:

Q This is a two-page document, and it's a -- it's an article from the Ukrainian press that a Blue Star staffer forwards to Ms. Tramontano and Ms. Painter.

A Yep.

Q And that gets forwarded along to Eric Schwerin. The headline of the article

is, "The interior ministry in Ukraine confirmed that Zlochevsky is no longer wanted."

Now that you see this --

Mr. Lowell. I'm sorry. Is he on this email?

[redacted]. He is not.

Mr. Lowell. Okay.

The Witness. So this is neither to me, from me, or cc'd? I'm not on this in any way?

BY [redacted]:

Q Correct.

A Okay.

Q Do you recall that the interior ministry at the time was investigating Zlochevsky?

A No.

Q I mean, you were on the board. So --

A I knew, I was aware of issues that they had, but I was not involved in anything that related to any of the criminal or pressures that they were under related to prosecution, either in Ukraine or outside.

Q Okay. Ms. Painter forwards it to Schwerin, like I mentioned, and she indicates, "We won and in less than a year." And I'm just wondering if you know what she's referring to.

A No, I do not. And, again, I'm not on this email. This email wasn't sent to me. I'm not cc'd on it. I'm not bcc'd on it. I don't have any -- any look into this email.

Q Well, you're a board member of Burisma.

A Yes.

Q And you helped broker the Blue Star arrangement. So, you know, I think

it's fair to ask you the question.

A Well, I would just look at the headline. "The interior ministry in Ukraine confirmed that Zlochevsky is no longer wanted."

I'm thinking what Blue Star Strategies is saying is that the company that they represent is, you know, got a good headline.

Q Okay. But you don't know what Ms. Painter means by, "We won and in less than a year"?

A I think that it's probably, if I read the article that was attached to it, it says that, "An adviser to the Minister of Internal Affairs -- I can't pronounce the name, so I won't try -- confirmed that the former Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources is no longer wanted. He stated this on TV channel 112." And it goes on to say, "Yes, in fact, today it was implemented. MIA performed a function," but that's the article.

And so what she is saying, I'm certain, is that -- I think this goes down. Prosecutor General Yuriy Lutsenko told about the disclosure of the gas train which carried blah, blah, blah.

So I think that it was a good development for internally inside of Ukraine in some way for Burisma.

[redacted]. Next exhibit I'm going to mark is number 15.

[Biden Exhibit No. 15
was marked for identification.]

Mr. Lowell. What's the number?

[redacted]. The next one's going to be number 15.

BY [redacted]:

Q This is a giant text pack prepared by the IRS investigators, summarizing, and in many cases, quoting WhatsApp message.

Mr. Lowell. Do you have the underlying message?

[redacted]. We have this document. This is what we have.

Mr. Lowell. I want to point out on the record that is all known to you that we have great reservations about the accuracy and completeness of what two IRS agents who have decided to go on television and try to promote what they believe should happen to Mr. Biden as having made a complete record.

And when there have been records, they have not been complete?

And when they make summaries, they are often quoting from texts or communications, which appear to have been altered by those other than themselves.

So with all that, you can certainly ask your questions. But I do not accept the premise that what you're about to ask him is either an authentic or authenticated or a complete document.

[redacted]. Okay.

Mr. Lowell. With that in mind, let's go.

[redacted]. Okay.

BY [redacted]:

Q Just to set expectations here, I'm going to refer to three. Okay? Then we'll be done with this document for now.

A Page 3?

Q I'm going to refer to three sort of topics --

A Okay.

Q -- within this giant document, not 148. We're not going to go through every page. I'm sort of managing your expectations here.

A Thank you.

Q I'd like you to turn to page 4, and it's a message dated July 30th, 2017. It's

about halfway down the page and it begins, "WA message with SM." And that's the -- that stands for Sportsman, and that's what they called you, and Zhao.

Have you identified the one that I'm referring to?

Mr. Lowell. It's down the page. It's the only one for the 30th?

[redacted]. Correct.

Mr. Lowell. Okay. Yes.

BY [redacted]:

Q And so the text, according to the IRS, the Federal investigators, say, "Z, please have the director call me, moment James or Tony or Jim. Have him call me tonight. I'm sitting here with my father, and we would like to understand why the commitment made has not been fulfilled.

"I'm very concerned that the chairman has either changed his mind or broken our deal without telling me or that he's unaware of the promises and assurances that have been made have not been kept.

"Tell the director I would like to resolve this now before it gets out of hand, and now means tonight. And, Z, if I get a call or text from anyone involved in this other than you, Zhang or the chairman, I will make certain that between the man sitting next to me and every person he knows and my ability to forever hold a grudge that you will regret not following my direction.

All too often people make mistakes -- sorry.

"All too often people mistake kindness for weakness, and all too often I'm standing over the top of them, saying, I warned you.

"From this moment until whenever he reaches me. It's 9:45 a.m. here and I assume 9:45 p.m. there. So his night is running out."

Zhao responds, "Copy. I will call you on WhatsApp."

You respond, "Okay, my friend. I'm sitting here, waiting for the call, with my father. I sure hope whatever it is are you doing is very, very, very important."

Then Zhao says, "Hi, Hunter. Is it a good time to call now? Hi, Hunter, Director did not answer my call, but he got the message you just mentioned."

A Yeah.

Q Do you have any recollection of sending these?

A No, but I've seen this and --

Mr. Lowell. Is there a question?

[redacted]. Yes. Does he have a recollection of sending the message?

The Witness. And I do not, but I do know this. I have now seen it, which it's been presented. I would say two things about this message.

Mr. Nadler. Can you speak up?

The Witness. I would say two things about this message. The first thing is this. Is that the Zhao that this is sent to is not the Zhao that was connected to CEFC.

BY [redacted]:

Q Okay.

A Which I think is the best indication of how out of my mind I was at this moment in time.

Again, I don't -- my addiction is not an excuse, but I can tell you this: I am more embarrassed of this text message, if it actually did come from me, than any text message I've ever sent.

The fact of the matter is, is that there's no other text message that you have in which I say anything remotely to this. And I was out of my mind.

I can also tell you this: My father was not sitting next to me. My father had no awareness. My father had no awareness of the business that I was doing. My father

never benefited from any of the business that I was doing.

And so, I take full responsibility for being an absolute ass and idiot when I sent this message, if I did send this message.

Q Okay.

[redacted]. When you say it wasn't Zhao from CEFC, who --

Mr. Nadler. Would you speak up, please?

[redacted]. Which Zhao are you referring to if it wasn't from CEFC?

The Witness. The number that I believe it went to was to Henry Zhao. Zhao is a very common -- it's not a surname -- surname in China. I mean, obviously, very common surname.

And I, like an idiot, directed it towards Henry Zhao who had no involvement, who had no understanding or even remotely knew what the hell I was even Goddamn talking about.

Excuse my language.

BY [redacted]:

Q And he seems to --

A No, no, no, no, no, the Zhao -- it's a different -- you're conflating now.

Q Okay.

A And this why this report from the IRS is absolutely wrong. They're two different messages.

The Zhao that calls me is not related to the message that was sent. I speak to him the next day. They're two completely different sets of messages. One goes a number because, I made the Goddamn -- excuse my language again -- because I made like an idiot, and I was drunk and probably high, sent a -- this ridiculous message to a Zhao, to a Henry Zhao.

But then the next day, I speak to a Raymond Zhao, who has never received the message that Henry Zhao got. And so that's why this report is very misleading in many ways.

Mr. Lowell. That's exactly why I raised the point before you decided to ask questions. The IRS agents --

The Witness. I gave --

Mr. Lowell. -- took two different times and two different messages and conflated them. That's what he's explaining.

The Witness. And I can -- and we can show you that.

And I also could show you that on that message, there was never a Chinese flag and a picture of it, as I think was shown in the Oversight Committee before.

[redacted]. Okay. Going to refer to you page 9, the third message.

Mr. Lowell. This is four?

[redacted]. This is page 4. There's a page number at the bottom.

Mr. Lowell. Where? Where's the page?

[redacted]. It's at the bottom.

Mr. Lowell. Now I get it.

Mr. Goldman. [redacted], can you explain redactions?

[redacted]. This is how the document was produced from the IRS agents.

Mr. Goldman. Thank you.

Mr. Lowell. On page 9, which entry?

[redacted]. The third message.

Mr. Lowell. This one? I'm sorry.

[redacted]. It's dated --

Mr. Lowell. August 27th?

[redacted]. August, the third one down, it's dated August 27th --

Mr. Lowell. Got it.

[redacted]. -- 2017.

BY [redacted]:

Q It's a message between you and Kevin Dong. Who's Kevin Dong?

A Kevin Dong was the -- ultimately ended up becoming -- he was Mr. Ye's representative in the United States and was a part of the Hudson West Three group.

Q Okay.

A Yeah.

Q This is August 27, 2017. You write, "I will pick you up at 12:00 p.m. in the lobby of your hotel. The luncheon will start at 12:30 p.m."

"Where is the luncheon, Kevin? My uncle will be here with his brother," brother's all in caps, "who would like to say hello to the chairman. He is here to visit my daughter."

Do you have any recollection of sending a message of this sort?

A Again, I don't have a specific recollection of ever sending the text. But what I do see and what's produced here -- and if it is actually valid and verified -- is that my dad was -- what I think I'm saying is my dad was in town to visit my sis -- excuse me -- my daughter, who was at Columbia Law School at the time. My uncle was also in town.

I was going lunch with Kevin Dong, and it was the chance that Mr. Ye may join us for a lunch. And I said, Well, maybe we'll all stop by. That's exactly what I'm saying.

Q Okay.

A That never happened, though.

Q Okay. So when you're indicating that your -- that your dad was possibly

going to stop by and you put "brother" all in caps --

A Yeah.

Q -- referring to --

A Again, I just want to be clear.

Would there be something wrong if my dad was in New York, when he was out of office and he wasn't a candidate for office, and I didn't think he would ever be a candidate for office ever again, and he was in New York to visit my daughter and I was going lunch with some of my business associates, if I told he and my uncle to stop by and have a bite to eat? There is -- I don't understand how this rises to the level of the supposed inquiry that we're in right now. What is -- what's the issue?

Q I mean, he --

A What's the issue if he was out of office? Now I do see an issue if there is a -- if this was in, you know, a certain other date when he was in office or he was President of the United States.

Q But you said while he was running for President that he's never been involved --

A This is --

Q -- with any of your business.

A -- 2017, [redacted].

Q Yeah, but when he was running for President, he was --

A He was never going to.

Q When he was running for President, you said he never was involved with any of your business activity.

A He was not involved with any business activity.

Would you call it involvement if my dad was in New York City at the same time I

was in New York City and I was having lunch with some of my business associates, and I said, Hey, dad, come by for lunch?

Who wouldn't do that? Are you saying that you wouldn't do that with your father if he was in town at the same time --

[redacted]. Well, I don't think that.

The Witness. -- you were?

No, I'm being really serious. Would you not allow him to come to lunch with you and Mr. Jordan if you were discussing things as related to impeachment because your dad was a prosecutor?

Q Yeah, well, yeah.

A Would you do that? I don't understand it.

Q My dad was a biophysicist.

A Oh, your dad's a physicist.

Q So I don't think anyone would want to --

A Well, again, we could talk about, you know, the other things that he could somehow influence you.

Mr. Lowell. Let him ask the question.

BY [redacted]:

Q But I think it is fair to ask, because I don't think most people would have their dad come to a business meal with --

A Well, that's not true. You know that's not true. If he was in town at the same time and I was having lunch with some people that I knew that were buying and I said, Dad, hey, I probably invited my daughter, too.

Q Okay.

A Why wouldn't I?

Q Okay.

A I mean, I really mean it.

Mr. Fallon. I never did that my whole life. My father --

The Witness. You never invited your father to lunch.

Mr. Lowell. Hang on. Hang on. Hang on.

[redacted]. We're going to mark --

Mr. Lowell. Can I just --

The Witness. I can also tell you this.

Mr. Lowell. No, no, can you read the whole thing?

[redacted]. You can read it.

Mr. Lowell. Well, just remember that it says at the end, if it's complete, "So please give me the location and time." And it says, "Jim," so, Jim's involved, brother, "If he is -- if he is the coming, just wants to say hello and will not be stopping for lunch."

You missed that part.

BY [redacted]:

Q Fair enough. But the point is we're injecting --

A [redacted], I mean, fair enough, I mean, like, isn't that the whole thing? Isn't that the whole thing, is it not?

Q The whole thing is that the former Vice President is coming to meet potential --

A But he didn't, number one. You know that he didn't. Number two is that you know that I never involved him in any of my business. Number three is --

Q Well, that's --

A -- he never benefited from any of my business.

Number four, you know there are no evidence of any transactions in which I sent

money for my dad or my dad took action to benefit me or any of my businesses.

You know all of those things. But you look at one text message out of context. And when I say, Hey, my dad's going to be in town. He's also visiting my daughter, I'm going to have lunch, maybe we'll all get to see each other, because it's also with my uncle, I'd love him to meet my new partner, you say there's something wrong with that?

I really mean it. He's out of office.

Q I mean, I think it raises questions.

A No, he's out of office. You're saying he can't do that.

So when you -- when Jared Kushner flies over to Saudi Arabia, picks up $2 billion, comes back, and puts it in his pocket, okay, and he is running for President of the United States, you guys have any problem with that?

Mr. Gaetz. The clock has stopped.

[redacted]. Anyway --

The Witness. No, the clock has not stopped.

Do you guys have any problem with that? I'm asking.

[redacted]. I have one more question before our hour is up.

The Witness. It's unbelievable to me.

Mr. Lowell. You said there's one more? Go ahead.

The Witness. So my dad can't go to dinner?

[redacted]. We're running out of time. Before we go to the third one, I'm giving you exhibit No. 16.

Mr. Raskin. I'm sorry. What did you say? We do have a problem with that?

Let the record reflect --

Mr. Lowell. I'd love to hear the answer to that.

Chairman Comer. When we'll deal with influence peddling, we'll ask.

The Witness. Isn't that what this is about extensively.

Chairman Comer. By the way --

The Witness. That's what you're saying. So I just --

[redacted]. One more question before our hour's up and then we'll get a chance --

The Witness. You're really going to do that.

[redacted]. -- to have them --

The Witness. You're saying that what you're going to do is you're going to open an investigation into Jared Kushner alongside of what -- the things because I will say --

Chairman Comer. We may ask you.

The Witness. Is that --

Chairman Comer. He has the same attorney. That's what I'm saying.

Mr. Lowell. Mr. Comer, you are absolutely wrong. I represented one person at one time for a stupid investigation as to whether or not he had been involved in something called Russian interference. I have not represented him in any other matter.

And to say that we have the same attorney is really just another example how you say things, and you pretend that they're real because they come out of your mouth, but they tend not to be so.

So I take offense by what you just said.

Mr. Jordan. [redacted], let's go back on the record.

[redacted]. So I've just marked exhibit 16.

The Witness. Did we stop the clock for some reason?

Mr. Jordan. We got 4 minutes left.

The Witness. So, I mean, his is at 57. Hers is at 56 and we're stopping and yours is stopped.

Mr. Lowell. Let's keep going, please. Go ahead.

The Witness. No, actually his time was an hour.

But, regardless, I'll stay if you got more than an hour.

Mr. Lowell. Let's finish this exhibit, please.

[Biden Exhibit No. 16
was marked for identification.]

BY [redacted]:

Q Exhibit 16 is a subject, Expectations. It's from James Gilliar to Tony Bobulinski. Rob Walker and yourself.

Have you seen this email before?

A I have. I've seen it, I think, as we all have, 8,642,300 times.

Q Okay. And you'd expected we'd ask you about it here today, correct?

A Of course, I did, yeah.

Q Okay.

A Yeah.

Q At the bottom, so I'll skip reading the whole email if I may. And at the bottom, it says, "At the moment, there's provisional agreement that the equity will be distributed as follows.

A Uh-huh.

Q "20 to H," which presumably is yourself. Is that correct?

A Yes.

Q "20, RW," that's Rob Walker, correct?

A Yes.

Q "20, James Gilliar." Is that correct?

A Yes.

Q "20, TB." Is that Tony Bobulinski?

A Yes.

Q "10, Jim," is that your uncle?

A Yes.

Q And then "10 held by H," which would be you, "for the big guy," which presumably is your dad, correct?

Mr. Goldman. Question mark, correct?

BY [redacted]:

Q Question mark.

A Question mark. Not only question mark, but all I know this is, is that, number one, there's only one agreement that includes Tony Bobulinski, that is executed, that is signed by me. There's only one message that I had as it relates to any involvement that I had with Tony Bobulinski, James Gilliar, my uncle, and Rob Walker, and it did not involve my dad.

There's an executed agreement in which I got 20 percent, Jim got 20 percent, Rob got 20 percent, Tony got 20 percent, and James Gilliar got 20 percent. Nothing do with Joe Biden.

And the only agreement that was drafted before that had 50-50, and I was -- I was the one 50. I was 50, and Mr. Ye was the other 50.

And the only company that ever existed that had any involvement with Mr. Ye that was ever an actual operating company was the company Hudson West Three, in which I owned 50 percent, and Mr. Ye owned 50 percent.

So this idea that because James Gilliar goes out and he says to Tony, You guys have seen the communications of Tony. You have the communications of Tony.

I told Tony literally weeks after I met him that he was out of his mind, that he was

going around, trying to promote the idea that my dad was somehow going to be involved in this. And that's why I never did business with Tony.

And that's why Tony is a bitter, bitter man that did not get in on a deal that he wanted to get in on, because I thought that he was both incompetent and an idiot. And he's proved himself to be so by the complete misstatements that he's made.

I do know that Tony said that he was never at a meeting with Mark Meadows at a rally in, I forget where it was in Missouri and that he never wore a ski mask until the next day you get a picture with Mr. Meadows behind a car with Tony Bobulinski with a ski mask.

Did he say that to you under oath, Mr. Comer? Did he tell you that under oath? Because he also said under oath to the FBI that he was at a meeting with Mr. Ye in Miami. And then he said -- he said it under oath to the FBI is he went in --

Q But that was a 302.

A Oh, wait a second.

Q And he contested the FBI got it wrong.

A You guys are going to tell me that 302s are not -- you guys are going to tell me that you can't trust a 302 --

Q We are going to tell you --

A -- but you can trust a 1020.

So you guys are actually going to tell me that you --

Q We're going to tell you --

A -- you can't trust a 302 but you can a 1023. You can trust that one.

Q We're going to tell you that Mr. Jordan has a bill --

A Can you tell me that, Ms. Greene?

Ms. Greene. I said it was their most credible informant. So truly not be able to

believe that that --

The Witness. So should I not believe the credible FBI? Should I not -- so you're saying the FBI are liars.

Ms. Greene. I thought you were -- I didn't think you --

The Witness. Alexander Smirnov who has Russian contacts is not a liar.

[redacted]. Before we go off the record, I want one last question.

The Witness. No, let's stay on the record for this discussion.

[redacted]. Well --

The Witness. Let's talk about it.

So you're telling me, Ms. Greene, you don't trust the FBI notetaker, six of them, six of them.

Ms. Greene. Are you a businessman, or are you involved in government, Mr. Biden?

The Witness. Here's what I am. I'm both an attorney, a businessman, and a concerned citizen, Ms. Greene. That's what I am.

Ms. Greene. Just an average citizen.

[redacted]. So just --

Mr. Jordan. One final question.

BY [redacted]:

Q One final question, because our round is up, I know everyone's disappointed by that.

But the reference to the big guy, you would agree, is a reference to your father?

A I truly don't know what the hell that James was talking about. All I know is that what actually happened.

All I know is that what was executed in the agreement, and the agreement didn't

have anything to do with my father. My father's never been involved with my business. He's never benefited from my business, and he's never taken an action to benefit me or any of my business.

Q If that's the case, though, why is Gilliar drafting something like that?

A Because I think that it was just as Rob Walker said. I think that it was pie in the sky. Like Joe Biden's out of the office. Maybe we'll be able to get him involved. Remember, again, is that Joe Biden, for first time in 48 years, is not an elected official and is not seeking office. And so James is probably, like, wow, wouldn't be great if a former Vice President could be in our business together?

And I say you're out of your mind. My dad knows less about doing cross-border blah, blah, blah, than he does about -- I mean, it's just ridiculous. It's absolutely ridiculous.

And so I shut it down, and the evidence of me shutting it down is the actual things you have as evidence. Remember that. The agreement, the executed agreement, the executed agreement to create a company that was never operated, that's what happened. That's the evidence you have. You have the evidence of the executed agreement between Hudson West Three, me, and Mr. Ye. You have that.

Nothing to do with my dad, zero.

Q With that --

A You're shaking your head and I apologize for it because -- not you, behind you -- Congresswoman, is that you keep shaking your head, but you explain to me how I'm wrong. Explain to me. I would really love you to explain.

Ms. Hageman. This is the deposition of you, not of me.

The Witness. No, but you keep shaking your head. I'm not -- I am truly -- no, Congresswoman --

Mr. Lowell. She said what she has to say.

[redacted]. We're ready to go off the record.

[Discussion off the record.]

[1:56 p.m.]

[redacted]. It is 1:56.

We can go back on the record.

BY [redacted]:

Q Good afternoon, Mr. Biden.

I want to come back to exhibit 16, which is the last exhibit my Republican colleagues introduced, the email from James Gilliar to Tony Bobulinski, cc'ing Rob Walker and you, in which he has that question at the end, "10 held by H for the big guy?"

A Yes.

Q I just want to be very clear. This is an email sent by James Gilliar. He's the one making this suggestion, posing this question.

A Yes.

Q This is not from you?

A Yes.

Q You never suggested that your father become involved in your business dealings with CEFC.

A I never suggested that. That never happened.

Q And I think during your round of questioning, you talked about how, you know, this idea that he would join is kind of crazy and you would shut it down. And I wanted to ask you kind of: What -- why was that your view?

A Well, it was my view because my father's never been involved in any of my businesses. He's never taken a role, never had any stake in any of my businesses, or benefited from any of my businesses. And it's just something that I would not do.

And I would particularly not do it at the suggestion of people that -- that I had a

very tangential relationship with at that time.

There's just no truth to it. There's no reality to it.

Mr. Roy. I hate to ask this.

Mr. Biden. Sorry. Yeah, sorry. I apologize.

There's no reality to it, no truth to it.

BY [redacted]:

Q Now, Tony Bobulinski provided some text message -- and, actually, let me correct myself -- some photographs of a Blackberry purporting to show messages to the Oversight Committee's Republican staff. He didn't provide his entire phone. We've asked for it. He's refused to provide it. He just provided a certain number of screenshots.

Mr. Lowell. Are they screenshots or are they photographs of --

[redacted]. They're photographs of a screen.

Mr. Lowell. Okay.

BY [redacted]:

Q And so, we don't know the full content of these text messages, but we received a few. And I want to talk about just two of them with you which I'll mark. I think we're now at exhibit 17 and 18.

[Biden Exhibits Nos. 17 and 18 were marked for identification.]

BY [redacted]:

Q I'll pass around exhibit 17 and exhibit 18.

So the email we were just looking at, exhibit 16, from James Gilliar, was dated May 13th, 2017.

A I'm sorry. I'm just getting set up here. 18 or 17 are we talking about?

Q This is 17. It starts with, "Brother, please."

A Got it.

Q Then 18 is, "Later, Bro."

A Okay.

Q So these two photographs of a telephone that Mr. Bobulinski provided to committee Republican staff appear to be dated May 11th, and Mr. Bobulinski represented under oath that that was 2017, so just two days before the email we were just looking at.

Do you see that?

A Yes.

Q Now these message are from Mr. Bobulinski's phone, and they're from James Gilliar. So the only two people on that chain are James Gilliar and Tony Bobulinski.

Do you have any basis to disagree with that?

A I have no basis to disagree with that.

Q You are not on this text chain, right?

A Not that I know of.

Q Okay. And Mr. Bobulinski testified similarly that it was just him and Mr. Gilliar.

And so I want to read you the first one, 17, which is Mr. Bobulinski purportedly telling Mr. Gilliar, "Brother, please listen to me. You have to open your eyes a bit more and not take things at face value with these guys. They are calculated, and they are running multiple horses in the race and covering all their bases."

And Mr. Bobulinski represented "they" here is talking about CEFC and Chairman Ye.

"H and Biden should have been insulted they weren't invited. The BS about the GFND is just that, BS."

And then there's this other text message from James Gilliar, exhibit 18, in which he tells Mr. Bobulinski, "Later Bro. Man, you are right. Let's get the company set up. Then tell H and family the high stakes and get Joe involved."

Now were you aware on May 11th at the time these text messages were being sent that Mr. Gilliar and Mr. Bobulinski were having this conversation?

A Absolutely not.

Q And is it clear from reading this that what they appear to be discussing between themselves behind your back is a plan to try to convince to you get your father, Joe Biden, involved?

A It appears that that's the case.

Q Do you recall them bringing this proposal to your attention?

A No, because the -- I would have shut this down faster than anything, and it's one of the reasons why I had no faith in this person that I had just met, Tony Bobulinski, who was presented to me as some Wall Street whiz kid that was going around, throwing around my name, and throwing around my family's name.

Q And shortly after these message, you, in fact, ceased your partnership with Tony Bobulinski, James Gilliar, and Rob Walker --

A Yes.

Q -- with regard to CEFC. Is that right?

A Yes.

Q And why is that?

A Because I had no faith in Mr. Bobulinski. I think that you can see of the documents that were sent to us in preparation for this, there are many instances in which

I call Mr. Bobulinski out for his what I would call complete absurdities.

One of these would be this absurdity, this idea that Mr. Bobulinski was somehow going to take control of the Biden name and then have a control of a company, and then go out and do whatever the hell he wanted to do with it was obviously something that I had zero interest in being involved with.

[2:04 p.m.]

BY [redacted]:

Q And this venture you had with Mr. Bobulinski and others, it never got funded, right?

A That's exactly right.

Q No money actually came in?

A That's exactly right.

Q You did at some point, though, through an entity called Hudson West III, go into a venture with CEFC in 2017 and 2018. Is that right?

A That's right, yes.

Q And, in that venture, you were working with your brother Jim Biden?

A My uncle.

Q Your uncle, sorry, Jim Biden. Is that right?

A Yes, yes.

Q And why did you decide to go to do that venture with just your uncle?

A Because I lost complete faith in Mr. Bobulinski. I did not find him to be credible. I did not find him to be competent. I found him to be arrogant. I found him to often not tell the full truth or the truth at all. And, therefore, I had no faith to have him as a partner in any business.

And so, therefore, I told Mr. Gilliar and Mr. Walker that I was going on my own. I was -- if they wanted to join me, that was -- that would be fine, but I would not be involved with Tony Bobulinski.

Q And did you trust your brother -- your uncle, Jim Biden, and go into business with him?

A 100 percent. I trust my uncle implicitly. And he's not only my uncle, but he's one of my closest friends and mentors and confidantes.

Q And trusting him also means that you trusted him not to stupidly suggest that your father was in any way involved in your business deal?

A No, he would never do such a thing.

Q And why?

A Because I've known my uncle since the day I was born. And I know that my uncle cares as much about my -- how he represents his name and how he is -- has been, if anything, the most protective person in my family to -- to all of us, to all of us with the last name Biden and even the ones that don't have the last name Biden that are -- that are blood. That's why.

Q And the fact of the matter is that your father was not involved in this business venture in any way. Is that right?

A Exactly. The bottom line is, at the end of the day, not even at the beginning of the day or in any day was my father involved in any business that I've ever done.

Mr. Goldman. Can I jump in? Are you're done? Whenever you're done with this line of questioning?

[redacted]. Sure.

BY [redacted]:

Q I just wanted to read you a quote from The Wall Street Journal in an October 23rd, 2020, piece entitled "Hunter Biden's ex-business partner alleges father knew about venture," which has a quote from James Gilliar in which he says, "I would like to clear up any speculation that former Vice President Biden was involved with the 2017 discussions about our potential business structure. I am unaware of any involvement at any time of

the former Vice President. The activity in question never delivered any project revenue."

Do you agree with that statement by Mr. Gilliar?

A That's an accurate statement.

Mr. Goldman. These two text messages are dated May 11th, according to the date on here, May 11, 2017.

Do you have the email that James Gilliar sent to Tony Bobulinski and cc'd you and Mr. Walker that the Republican counsel went over?

The Witness. I do have it in front of me.

Mr. Lowell. I think you're referring to exhibit 16.

Mr. Goldman. I don't know.

So these two text messages where James Gilliar and Tony Bobulinski are scheming to get your father involved happened on May 11th. And then what is the date of this email where James Gilliar suggests an equity distribution of a similar division that was in the original plan with you and Rob Walker, Tony Bobulinski and James Gilliar, and then adds 10 percent for your uncle, and then James Gilliar suggests, with a question mark, "10 held by H for the big guy."

What date is that email?

The Witness. That is May 13th, 2017.

Mr. Goldman. And so that's 2 days after this text conversation between James Gilliar and Tony Bobulinski, right?

The Witness. That appears to be correct, yes.

Mr. Goldman. And you didn't respond to that suggested equity distribution, did you?

The Witness. No, I do not see a response to that.

Mr. Goldman. And then you entered into a formal agreement with your partners for, was it Oneida?

The Witness. Oneida, yes. And then to hold equity in SinoHawk. That would be the partner too, yeah.

Mr. Goldman. But your agreement was splitting up Oneida --

The Witness. Yes.

Mr. Goldman. -- with these same business partners?

The Witness. That is correct.

Mr. Goldman. And that agreement was signed officially and had 20 percent for you, 20 percent for Rob Walker, 20 percent for Gilliar, 20 percent for Tony Bobulinski and 20 percent for your Uncle Jim, right?

The Witness. That is correct.

Mr. Goldman. And do you remember approximately when that was signed? We probably have it here. I don't have it. If you don't --

The Witness. I do. May 23rd, I believe.

Mr. Goldman. So that was 10 days after this email?

The Witness. Yes.

Mr. Goldman. And you had mentioned that you were suspicious of Tony Bobulinski because you didn't trust him, you didn't think he was credible. But were you conscious of his or -- his efforts to try to get your father involved?

The Witness. No. I was not fully conscious of any efforts that they other -- supposedly. I don't remember if I ever even read this email that I was cc'd on.

But they never -- they never spoke to it -- to me about it. They would have known never to suggest that to me. Rob Walker has known me since 1998. And, if Rob had talked to them beforehand, he would say that you are way out of bounds. And

so I don't have any recollection of them particularly proposing that.

But, to answer your question, the thing that concerned me about Tony Bobulinski is that, number one, his background did not match what he told me his background was. There was no record of his background, in terms of business or otherwise, of why he would be a good partner. And he was never willing to expand on that with me.

And the second most biggest red flag was that the business partnership that he proposed, proposed that he have absolute and complete control. He even put into that agreement something to the effect that he has control of the brand, meaning that he would have control of Oneida. What I soon learned what he meant is that he could use the Biden name anywhere that he wanted to.

And I think that there's communications that you have where I used very, very, very colorful language with Tony Bobulinski. And I think at some point I even offered to get into a wrestling match with him, which would have been very, very stupid, because he was supposedly a very good wrestler.

But the point being is that I did not trust him, and that was clear at the outset. And, while I entered into that agreement, quickly it devolved into shouting matches between me and Tony. And I said, "I do not want to have anything to do with you, Tony." And that's how it ended.

Mr. Goldman. And was he bitter about it ending that way?

The Witness. He was very, very bitter. And, according to Rob, he made threats at the time. He made threats afterwards. He said that he would get his revenge and things like that, according to Rob at the time, that I think the exact words were -- excuse my language -- you have no idea who you're Fing with.

[redacted]. Just so the record is complete, I'm going to pass around as exhibit 19 the May 22, 2017, agreement, limited liability company agreement of Oneida Holdings

LLC.

[Biden Exhibit No. 19
was marked for identification.]

BY [redacted]:

Q And I'll direct your attention to the signatures that come at the end right before schedules I and II.

A Yes.

Q And those signatures represent the members of this entity. So it's you as manager of GK Temujin, Jim Biden as manager of Sino Atlantic Solutions, Rob Walker as managing director of Robinson Walker, James Gilliar as managing director of 8 International Holdings Limited, and Anthony Bobulinski as managing member of Global Investment Ventures, LLC.

Is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Those are the five partners?

A Yes.

Q There's no secret big guy anywhere in this email?

A No, there's not.

Q There's no secret additional partners?

A No, there's not.

Q Joe Biden is not anywhere in this agreement?

A No, he is not.

Q And GJ Temujin LLC, that's your entity?

A That was an entity that it was suggested that I create for the purposes of entering into this agreement at the time, yes.

Q And, just to be clear, Joe Biden had no interest or involvement in GK Temujin LLC either?

A No, he did not.

Q And, if you turn to the Schedule I, it shows the shares of each partner, and you each have a 20-percent share?

A That's exactly right.

Q So there's no additional 10-percent share anywhere for anyone?

A That's exactly right.

Q And then you were discussing Mr. Bobulinski wanting to have a greater say over the company. If you turn to page 8, article IV, Management, do you see under section 4.2 (b), "manager vote"?

A Yes.

Q Do you see it says each manager shall have one vote weighted as follows: (i) The GKT manager has one-seventh.

A Yes.

Q And that's you, right?

A Yes.

Q (ii), the Sino Atlantic manager, one-seventh, and that's your Uncle Jim, right?

A Yes.

Q The Walker Manager one-seventh, and that's Rob Walker, right?

A Yes.

Q The 8 International Manager one-seventh, and that's James Gilliar, right?

A Yes.

Q And then the GIV Manager three-sevenths, and that's Tony Bobulinski?

A Yes, yes.

Q So Tony Bobulinski had three times the voting power that you or any other partner in this venture had under this agreement?

A That's exactly right.

Q And you viewed that as a problem, right?

A I viewed that as a very significant problem.

[redacted]. We want to go through one more text message, which, again, is a photo of a Blackberry of Mr. Bobulinski -- a Blackberry photo that Mr. Bobulinski provided.

Mr. Lowell. With your understanding, as I've already pointed out, that we have grave concerns about the authenticity and completeness of what Mr. Bobulinski says he took a photograph of, of a device which he says is broken and has not provided for anybody for forensic examination. With that, please ask your question.

[redacted]. Understood. And I'll note that, on this, which I'll mark as exhibit 20, there is no date stamp and the list of -- it refers to the Oneida Holdings team as being the list of recipients, but the complete list of recipients isn't visible on the face of it.

And we're going to mark this as exhibit 20.

[Biden Exhibit No. 20
was marked for identification.]

BY [redacted]:

Q I'm going to read into the record the text here. It says, "Hey, Tony" -- and this is a text message from you to, again, a group titled the Oneida Holdings team. The list of individuals in that team isn't fully clear. It's clear James Gilliar is part of it. Beyond that, it's obscured.

The text message from you says, "Hey, Tony, I have an idea. In light of the fact that we are at an impasse of sorts, and both James' lawyers and my chairman gave an

emphatic no -- I think we should all meet in Romania on Tuesday next week," and then it continues on.

Do you recall this text message?

A I do not recall the text message, but if -- I don't have any issue with it.

Q I want to focus in on the language "my chairman" that you use.

A Yes.

Q There have been allegations that the use of the term "my chairman" was a reference to your father.

Do you have a response to those allegations?

A Yes. It's that the reference here to my chairman is clearly to the two different chairmen. If you do business and you've ever been to China, anyone that is -- whether you're the -- you run a popsicle stand or you run a multinational corporation, you're referred to as the chairman.

And, in CEFC, there were two people that we regularly referred to as chairman. One was Chairman Ye, who was the titular chairman of the company, and the other was Mr. Zhang. Chairman Zhang, also when you would meet with him, you would refer to him as Chairman Zhang.

Tony and Rob -- excuse me. Tony and James were talking to Zhang. I was talking to Ye, which is one of the conflicting things between us to begin with. That's the chairman I'm referring to.

Q Was it your practice to refer to your father as "my chairman"?

A I don't know that I've ever, ever referred to my father as my chairman.

Q So it's fair to say that the suggestion that "my chairman" here somehow refers to Joe Biden is just completely baseless?

A Yes. It's laughable.

Mr. Raskin. Just, on the question of nicknames, I have not seen your father referred to as the big guy anywhere else in this record. Was that his nickname in your family, the big guy?

The Witness. No.

Mr. Raskin. Did you ever call him the big guy?

The Witness. No, I never called him that.

Mr. Raskin. Okay. And I think Mr. Swalwell had a few --

Mr. Goldman. Just one last thing on this text message. It says at the beginning, "In light of the fact we are at an impasse of sorts."

Is that a reference to the evolving disagreement that you had with Mr. Bobulinski about the division of shares --

The Witness. Yes.

Mr. Goldman. -- as well as your concerns of his -- working with him?

The Witness. Exactly. And I don't -- what is the date of this?

[redacted]. We don't have a date on it.

The Witness. Yeah, exactly. I don't know. So there was constant friction between Mr. Bobulinski and myself and my uncle, who -- like the three-sevenths when everybody else got one-seventh or -- it just didn't make sense to us. And we were at a constant impasse together and constantly fighting.

Mr. Swalwell. I can tell you the date wasn't any time recently, because this is from a Blackberry. They don't make those anymore. We might get the pager code later from the majority.

Any time your father was in government, prior to the Presidency or before, did he ever operate a hotel?

The Witness. No, he has never operated a hotel.

Mr. Swalwell. So he's never operated a hotel where foreign nationals spent millions at that hotel while he was in office?

The Witness. No, he has not.

Mr. Swalwell. Did your father ever employ in the Oval Office any direct family member to also work in the Oval Office?

The Witness. My father has never employed any direct family members, to my knowledge.

Mr. Swalwell. While your father was President, did anyone in the family receive 41 trademarks from China?

The Witness. No.

Mr. Swalwell. As President and the leader of the party, has your father ever tried to install as the chairperson of the party a daughter-in-law or anyone else in the family?

The Witness. No. And I don't think that anyone in my family would be crazy enough to want to be the chairperson of the DNC.

Mr. Swalwell. Has your father ever in his time as an adult been fined $355 million by any State that he worked in?

The Witness. No, he has not, thank God.

Mr. Swalwell. Anyone in your family ever strike a multibillion dollar deal with the Saudi Government while your father was in office?

The Witness. No.

Mr. Swalwell. That's all I've got.

The Witness. Thank you.

[redacted]. We can go off the record. Thank you.

[Recess.]

[redacted]. We'll go back on the record. It's 2:23.

We're going to mark exhibit 21.

[Biden Exhibit No. 21
was marked for identification.]

BY [redacted]:

Q Do you recall -- just while the exhibit is being passed around, do you recall responding to Mr. Gilliar's message about the 10 held by H for the big guy?

A I do not.

Mr. Lowell. I'm sorry. Do you mean responding to that part of it or further in the chain where there's another subject? Do you have a document?

[redacted]. Yeah, we had a document, so I'm pulling it out.

Mr. Lowell. Let's look at the document.

[redacted]. A couple days later, you respond to Mr. Gilliar.

Mr. Lowell. Where it says "beyond office space"?

[redacted]. "Final word on this," it begins.

Mr. Lowell. No, no. Sorry. A few days later, Mr. Biden responds to Mr. Gilliar, and he says, "Beyond office space" is the first response.

[redacted]. Did we give you the wrong one?

The Witness. No, it's on here. But I think you're -- so it says this --

Mr. Lowell. Hold on. I'm sorry. On the bottom of the -- sorry to be -- you gave me a document that has four pages. The 10 percent one is the last of it. And then you asked Mr. Biden whether he responded a few days later.

And my first response that I see from Mr. Biden says, "Beyond office space."

Is that what you're responding to?

[redacted]. Yeah.

Mr. Lowell. May 16th, 2017, at 10:06 a.m., from Hunter to James, Tony, Rob,

regarding expectations. That's his response, the first response. Maybe I'm just not reading it correctly.

The Witness. No, you're reading it correctly because the next response --

BY [redacted]:

Q Indeed, we did have two different documents. I apologize for that.

In the sake of expediency, we'll just -- we have a couple responses from you, but in none of them does it dispute the 10 held by H for the big guy.

Is that your recollection?

A I don't see that in these two responses.

Q The responses that we've been able to find, we don't see any where you responded, "That's crazy, what is 10 held by H for the big guy supposed to mean?"

Mr. Lowell. Question mark.

The Witness. Yeah, question mark. No, I don't -- there's no document in front of me that says that.

BY [redacted]:

Q But do you remember any communications where you did try to disabuse Mr. Gilliar?

A No. I'm not even sure whether I ever fully read this. All I know is that my response has nothing to do with my father. It has absolutely zero -- my response doesn't mention any additional determination of percentages that would go to my father or anything.

Q Okay.

A The only document that I do have is the executed document, which has 20 percent for me equally divided among the five partners that doesn't include my father.

[redacted]. Mark the next exhibit. It's some more of these photographs of

Tony Bobulinski's Blackberry device. It will be exhibit No. 22.

[Biden Exhibit No. 22
was marked for identification.]

BY [redacted]:

Q Mr. Bobulinski represented to us that these were exchanges that he had between you, and some of them involved Rob Walker.

And he says he photographed his Blackberry. And, to the extent there is not a year listed, he advised us that the year was 2017.

A Okay. Do you know the month?

Q And there are -- I believe it does have the month and the day.

A Got it. Oh, so this is when I first met Tony. Okay.

Q So I'm going to -- the third page from the back of the pack is a Rob Walker message.

A Counting three back?

Q It's not the penultimate. It's one before the penultimate.

Mr. Lowell. The one that says Rob Walker. Would you tell me the first line, please?

[redacted]. "No. When he said his chairman he was talking about his dad."

Mr. Lowell. Can I also, before you start asking questions about this, you stapled these photographs together.

[redacted]. Yes.

Mr. Lowell. How -- and some of them have dates, and the date here is May 19th. Another date is May 2nd. What is in between those two dates, and is this a complete set of the exchanges?

[redacted]. So we were going to ask about some of these photographs

separately, and we thought, just for the ease of discussion, we would make it all one exhibit.

Mr. Lowell. So, on the one you're talking about, when Rob Walker is talking in this one --

[redacted]. It's dated May 19th.

Mr. Lowell. It is dated May 19th. Who is he talking to?

[redacted]. Tony Bobulinski.

Mr. Lowell. But not Mr. Biden?

[redacted]. Correct.

Mr. Lowell. Okay. Keep going.

BY [redacted]:

Q And it responds to the message that is one page before that the Democrats used in the last round.

And Mr. Walker says, "When he," meaning you, "said his chairman, he was talking about his dad."

And so I just wanted to get your reaction to that. This wasn't us, you know, making the chairman equals his dad. This was Rob Walker. This is where, to the extent the Republicans, the majority gets that, this is where we get it from.

A Okay. So, from a third party that was talking with another third party that was not involving me in the discussion making a judgment about what I was talking about.

Now, you have my answer under oath that I did not refer and never have referred to my father as chairman. You have my answer under oath that my father was never involved in any of my businesses, including this.

You have my answer under oath and under the penalty of perjury that I was not speaking about my father.

Q Okay. Have you ever spoken to Mr. Walker in a way that he thinks that your chairman meant your dad?

A No. And I don't know how or what Rob would have been reading into that. Maybe he read into it incorrectly.

Q Okay. But Rob Walker is somebody that -- a former business partner. You have a lot of respect for Mr. Walker? He's a --

A Yes, I'm very close with Rob. Just, in May 19th in 2017, when my dad was neither elected to office nor running for any office, he misconstrued something that I said to a third party.

Q Okay. And then, finally, I'm going to turn you or turn your attention to the first page, and this is WhatsApp messages with you and Mr. Bobulinski.

A I think it's really important for all of these to say each time that these are not WhatsApp messages between me and Mr. Bobulinski. These are photographs of a broken screen of a Blackberry cell phone that we have no forensic value, and I have no idea where they came from. And Mr. Bobulinski has refused to actually give you any forensic copy of this. That's what I think is important.

Q Okay.

A I know you think I'm being pedantic here, but I'm not, because it's really important.

Q So the first message says, "Morning, please let me know if we will do early dinner with your uncle and dad and where, also for document translation do you want it in simple Chinese or traditional?"

You respond, "Not sure on dinner yet, and whatever is the most common for a Chinese legal DOC."

A Yes.

Q Do you remember this exchange, or what was going on between you and Mr. Bobulinski at this time?

A Yes. At this time was the first time I ever met Mr. Bobulinski. He had a prior relationship with Mr. Gilliar. I believe that we were introduced either the night before or the day before. I don't know the exact date. I'm certain in some of these documents it's there.

And I was in Los Angeles for business meetings. My uncle was also in Los Angeles for business meetings. My father was going to speak at the Milken Conference in Los Angeles regarding the Cancer Moonshot.

And the night before, I believe I had had dinner with Mr. Bobulinski for the first time and was introduced to him. And I said to him that let's meet the next day.

Q And did Mr. Bobulinski meet with your father during that trip?

A He met him in the lobby of the hotel of the -- I believe it was the -- the --

Q Beverly Hilton?

A Beverly Hilton. My dad's flight arrived I think at 11 a.m. We --

Mr. Lowell. 11 p.m.

The Witness. Excuse me, 11 p.m. We were in the lobby bar with Mr. Bobulinski having coffee.

BY [redacted]:

Q And your uncle as well?

A What?

Q Was your uncle there too?

A My uncle and myself. I think my uncle was also staying at that hotel. And so yeah. I know that, if you go further, it says -- but I think that the reality is that he didn't -- anyway, my dad went and shook hands with Tony.

They talked about -- I believe at that time, I don't know whether it was Tony's father was suffering from cancer, and his sister was suffering from cancer, and he invited him to the speech at the Milken Conference.

Q Okay. Do you remember anything else from that conversation that Mr. Bobulinski had with your dad?

A No.

Q And then, the next morning, did he have a chance to meet with your dad as well?

A I believe that he went to the actual speech that my dad gave.

Q And did you witness any communications between the two?

A No, I did not witness any communications that I can remember.

Q But it's possible they did speak?

A Well, it would have to have happened literally in between the time my dad went up to speak in the hallway. I don't know if anybody else has ever been to the Milken Conference or a conference similar to that. You walk in. You go to make your speech. You speak to people in the hallway. You speak to people after they make -- after he makes his speech and comes down from the stage. But, no, there was no meeting, per se.

[redacted]. Mr. Biden, you don't need to repeat it, but if you could speak up.

The Witness. I'm sorry. I'm losing my voice a little bit here.

Mr. Gaetz. So, Mr. Biden, I'm going to draw your attention back to exhibit 21, and this appears to be this discussion about the big guy and your subsequent correspondence.

Why didn't you protest this 10 percent for the big guy?

The Witness. Well, you say that I didn't protest. You don't have an email

necessarily from me.

Mr. Gaetz. Did you protest the 10 percent?

The Witness. If I had seen it, I'm certain that what I would have done is I would have picked up the phone and said, "You're out of your mind."

And I literally probably didn't know what he was talking about, because, number one, if you look at it, the percentages were all wrong to begin with. The percentages were wrong in that I would never go into a business partnership with my uncle in which I got 20 percent and my uncle got 10 percent. He would be my partner in it. That's number one.

Mr. Gaetz. Unless your dad was getting 10 percent.

The Witness. No.

Mr. Gaetz. Let's go back to that reference to the phone call.

The Witness. That's not what it says here.

Mr. Gaetz. Excuse me, Mr. Biden.

The Witness. I was in the middle --

Mr. Lowell. You asked him a question. Do you want to know the answer or do you want to make a speech?

Mr. Gaetz. Mr. Lowell, I have limited time. I'm going to ask the questions and --

The Witness. This is not a public hearing. If it was a public hearing --

Mr. Gaetz. I'm aware, Mr. Biden.

My next question to you is whether or not you placed any phone call or engaged in any effort to protest 10 percent for the big guy?

The Witness. I do not know, just as I do not remember ever seeing this until it became a part of every story that has been promoted about this. I don't remember if I

picked up the phone or what I said, but I know that I would absolutely have objected to it if I saw it, which is evidenced by the fact that my father was never an equity holder in any business in which I was involved with Tony Bobulinski.

Mr. Gaetz. Yeah, I guess the question is whether or not you received that information and protested in some way other than in writing, if you didn't protest it, or if you don't remember.

Am I to understand your testimony correctly that you do not remember whether or not you protested this concept of an agreement to give 10 percent to your father?

The Witness. Again, I can't answer that question other than to say, is that, if I had read it and understood it to be my father, I would have protested. However --

Mr. Gaetz. How often do you reply to emails that you don't read?

The Witness. At that time, I think I replied to a lot of emails that I don't fully read. And you have whatever -- you have all my emails. You have every email that I've ever written and ones that I never wrote.

And so I can tell you that many times you miss something. You don't see it. But, regardless of anything, I can tell you this: My father was never an equity holder in any business that I was ever in. Whatever was proposed here never occurred.

What was proposed here occurred during 2017, when my father was neither in office nor a candidate for office. So please explain to me -- I'm sorry that I didn't live up to the standards that you've created about my responses to emails, but it didn't happen, so obviously I objected.

Mr. Gaetz. It seems odd that someone is articulating a family member of yours getting part of a deal. You now, in the context of this impeachment inquiry, have all of these protests about that, but you can't recall whether or not those ever materialized.

The Witness. Mr. Gaetz --

Mr. Gaetz. In 2019 --

The Witness. Is that a question or a statement? Really, I mean it. Is that a question?

Mr. Gaetz. We'll move on. In 2019, did you drop your laptop off at a repair shop?

The Witness. Not that I remember, no.

Mr. Gaetz. Did you have a laptop in 2019?

The Witness. I've had many laptops.

Mr. Gaetz. Did you typically keep a separate laptop for work and personal, or was it usually one laptop you operated with?

The Witness. I don't know. I don't think there was a distinction between necessarily work and personal.

Mr. Gaetz. Do you recall ever having dropped off a laptop at a repair shop?

Mr. Lowell. He asked and answered that, Mr. Gaetz,

Mr. Gaetz. No, Mr. Lowell, I asked if he recalled that in 2019. Now I'm asking if he ever recalls doing it.

Mr. Lowell. I'll point out that, as I said, that there are litigation about this issue. And I'll give you some leeway, but one of the things I discussed with staff is that we weren't going to get into the claims in litigation by the people that are both suing Mr. Biden and vice versa, but ask your next question.

Mr. Gaetz. Mr. Lowell, I'll tell you what. If I ask a question that you believe you've negotiated the scope out of, just indicate such.

Mr. Lowell. Well, it depends where you go next.

Mr. Gaetz. Did you ever drop a laptop off at a repair shop?

The Witness. I dropped a laptop off at the Apple repair shop that was literally

three blocks from my office in Washington, D.C. If I was ever going to repair one, I would have walked up the street and dropped it there.

Mr. Gaetz. Did you ever drop off a laptop in Delaware?

The Witness. The Apple store in Georgetown.

Mr. Gaetz. Yeah. My question is about Delaware. Did you ever drop off a laptop in Delaware?

The Witness. The largest Apple store in America is the -- the highest grossing and largest Apple store in America is at the Christiana Mall. If I was going to drop off a laptop -- I don't ever remember doing that, but if I was going to drop off a laptop, I would have gone to the Apple store, which was 7 minutes from my parents' home there.

Mr. Gaetz. Do you recall ever leaving a laptop at a repair shop?

The Witness. I do not.

Mr. Gaetz. On your laptop, did you have any sort of login credential?

The Witness. Just the typical like -- you know, like when you log into your --

Mr. Gaetz. Yeah.

The Witness. Of course.

Mr. Gaetz. Did you have two-factor authentication?

The Witness. I don't know.

Mr. Gaetz. Did anyone else have access to your laptop?

Mr. Lowell. Legally or illegally?

Mr. Gaetz. I'm just asking the question in the broadest term, Mr. Lowell.

The Witness. I do not know if anybody else had access. And what do you mean by "access"? Did they have access to my passwords, or did they have actual physical access to my laptop?

Mr. Gaetz. Did anyone else use your laptop?

The Witness. Well, I had at the time three daughters and all teenagers. I had a niece, nephew.

Mr. Gaetz. Did they use your laptop?

The Witness. I'm certain at some point.

Mr. Gaetz. Did they have separate logins, or did they know your login?

The Witness. They would have had separate logins, I believe. I don't remember, anyway.

Mr. Gaetz. Have you seen -- you've seen coverage of this laptop that purports to be yours that was dropped off in Delaware, right?

The Witness. Yes, yes. I've seen coverage.

Mr. Gaetz. In any of that coverage, have you seen any correspondence or other material that you know to be fabricated or false?

The Witness. Yes, I do.

Mr. Gaetz. What?

The Witness. And I can tell you, in particular, there is a fabricated conversation between me and a supposed Secret Service agent in a hotel room in Los Angeles. That Secret Service agent was -- has sworn an affidavit and attempted to sue The Daily Mail and The New York Post over the fact that he has never met me, he has never had any conversation with me, that he had never involvement with me, that we have never had any association whatsoever. And he swears --

Mr. Gaetz. Other than that conversation, are there any others that you recall?

The Witness. Yeah. There are many others. I can't go through them all right now. But, yes, there are many different things in there that are either -- that are either fabricated, hacked, stolen, or manipulated 100 percent.

Mr. Gaetz. Just list them for me.

The Witness. I got to list you all of the --

Mr. Lowell. We'll refer you to the litigation in Delaware where that can be found, including Mr. Costello and Mr. Giuliani's statements that that's exactly what they did.

The Witness. Yes. And all of those things that you have are in those documents.

Mr. Gaetz. Is Burisma a corrupt company?

The Witness. I don't believe that Burisma is a corrupt company.

Mr. Gaetz. So you take exception with Geoffrey Pyatt's criticisms of Burisma?

The Witness. No, I don't take exception with Mr. -- Ambassador Pyatt's criticisms of Burisma at that time. I think that there was an enormous amount of pressure that Burisma and the Ukrainians were under, and Ambassador Pyatt was doing his job in criticizing Ambassador -- or the prosecutor, Shokin, for not going after people that were perceived to have been involved in corruption in Ukraine.

Mr. Gaetz. And the people associated with Burisma got into legal trouble. That doesn't flavor your view of them as a corrupt company?

The Witness. Who is that?

Mr. Gaetz. I'm asking you.

The Witness. Who were the people that you're talking about that got into legal trouble?

Mr. Gaetz. Anyone.

The Witness. Name one.

Mr. Lowell. Can you name who got in trouble, please? You asked the question. Who are you referring to? Who?

Voice. Zlochevsky.

The Witness. Zlochevsky has never been indicted. He has never had -- he's never been prosecuted. He actually was --

Mr. Gaetz. Actually investigated. Yeah, I didn't say prosecuted or indicted.

The Witness. I -- what's the question?

Mr. Gaetz. Investigated, like those people were investigated.

The Witness. Yes, and there was -- no prosecution was ever brought against them.

Mr. Gaetz. How many stones were given to you by the Chinese?

The Witness. As I recall, one.

Mr. Gaetz. What value did you bring to Burisma?

The Witness. I would love to, again, read you the entirety of my resume.

Mr. Gaetz. No, that's the things you did before Burisma. I mean, when you were working at Burisma --

The Witness. Well, that's the value that I brought to Burisma. The things that I did before, my experience, the vast experience that I had. I was on over 13 different boards. I was the chairman of the board of the largest humanitarian organization, that supports the largest humanitarian organization in the world. I was the vice chairman of the board of the largest national passenger rail system.

Mr. Gaetz. Mr. Biden, I don't need you to go back through your resume.

The Witness. You just asked --

Mr. Gaetz. The question is, how did you deploy that experience for a million bucks a year for Burisma?

The Witness. How did I deploy that experience? By serving on the board in a transparent and ethical way, providing the best advice that I could give.

Just like any other board member on any other company in any other

organization, that's how you provide your value. And the value is your experience. The value is your ability to then transfer that experience into real-world action.

Mr. Gaetz. But you didn't have any experience as an energy executive, did you?

The Witness. Well, I would -- I would like you to understand what a board is. If you look at any board, most boards do not pick board members that are necessarily members of the particular industry in which they are in. What they do is they pull from different areas in which there is a need.

They didn't need anyone to tell them about how to drill natural gas. What they needed someone to do is to be able to help them with oversight and accountability and to do corporate governance. What they needed was someone like Alan Apter, who was not an energy executive but a lawyer in -- working at --

Mr. Gaetz. What need did you fill?

The Witness. What they -- I'm not finished. What they needed was someone like Cofer Black, who had a wide range of experience in foreign policy and in that area of the world.

What they needed was like -- someone like President Kwasniewski, who had a real understanding of the issues and the pressures that they were under at the time, none of which were energy executives. And I don't -- I would challenge you to look at the Fortune 500 companies.

Mr. Gaetz. What need did you fill, Mr. Biden? What need did you fill?

The Witness. What need? Was corporate governance. And I was an of counsel to Boies Schiller, one of the best law firms in the world at the time, and I, you know, specialized in corporate governance. I was the chairman of the corporate governance on the Amtrak board.

Mr. Gaetz. Were you on drugs when you were serving as the Burisma board

member?

Mr. Lowell. I'm not objecting to that. Hold on.

One of the things that I spoke to staff that you just asked about as to whether it's outside the bounds. If you want to spend the next part of the last hour you have asking about his drug use, go at it.

It's outside the scope. It certainly has no relevance to an impeachment inquiry nor does it have anything to do with oversight of ethics legislation that may address family members of Presidents or Vice Presidents.

So go at it, but it's outside the scope and you're wasting your time.

Mr. Gaetz. Were you on drugs when you were on the Burisma board?

The Witness. Mr. Gaetz, look me in the eye. You really think that's appropriate to ask me?

Mr. Gaetz. Absolutely.

The Witness. Of all the people sitting around this table, do you think that's appropriate to ask me?

Mr. Gaetz. Yeah. Are you going to answer it?

Mr. Lowell. You don't have to answer it.

The Witness. I'm not going to answer it. I've been explicit about --

Mr. Gaetz. So you're telling me --

The Witness. I will answer it this way: I have been absolutely transparent about my drug use. Again, I spoke to you all earlier this morning about that.

I'm sorry; I'm an addict. I was an addict. I have been in recovery for over 4 and a half years now, Mr. Gaetz. I work really, really hard at it. Let me answer. I work really hard at it, under an enormous amount of pressure.

Was I an addict? Yes, I was an addict. What does that have to do with whether

or not you're going to go forward with an impeachment of my father other than to simply try to embarrass me?

Mr. Gaetz. Mr. Biden --

The Witness. Why? Why?

Mr. Gaetz. We're asking the questions, not you. So I guess I'm trying to get a timeline for your addiction, because, in this testimony, you seem to take accountability for some actions and not others, and you say your addiction is the reason why you're unable to be accountable for the Zhang message that you sent.

The Witness. I've never said that I'm not accountable.

Mr. Gaetz. And so -- excuse me, Mr. Biden.

So I'm going to get a timeline of your addiction so we can ascertain which messages you've sent might have been impacted by that addiction and which weren't. It's not to embarrass you. I wish you well in your recovery.

So let's go over that. When did you first become an addict?

Mr. Lowell. We're not going to go into his addiction.

Mr. Gaetz. So you all aren't going to tell us when Mr. Biden --

The Witness. I can answer that question.

Mr. Gaetz. -- was and wasn't on drugs when we're -- when we're trying to figure out his influence peddling.

The Witness. Okay, Mr. Gaetz, Mr. Gaetz, if you're going to continue to go down this road, I'll answer it this way: I don't think anyone ever begins -- has a start date for their addiction.

If you've ever been to a 12-step program, you know what you do. You give your history, okay? You go in and you talk about the first time that you ever took a drink. That's the first time that I ever became an addict or an alcoholic. That is the time.

Over the course of my years of my life, I've had many instances in which I've gone and had long stretches of sobriety in which I was adhering to whatever program I had or whatever support that I was getting, and I was doing that.

Mr. Gaetz. Does your addiction impact your judgment?

The Witness. You're not letting me answer fully. I think addiction impacts everyone's judgment, of course.

Mr. Gaetz. Does it affect your impulses?

The Witness. Yes. I'm not a doctor.

Mr. Lowell. What do you mean, impulses?

Mr. Gaetz. Does it affect your memory of events?

The Witness. Yes, I'm certain it does. I'm certain that you can read in any -- I'm not a doctor, but I can tell you from experience that my addiction affected every -- you can stop, you got your answer -- every portion of my life.

Mr. Gaetz. And so, since your addiction affected every portion of your life, did every portion of your life include your business activities?

The Witness. In what way?

Mr. Gaetz. In any way.

The Witness. Well, be specific about what way you're asking, because I can tell you this, is that there's something called a high-functioning addict, in which you can actually go to a board meeting and you can actually participate in the board meeting, that you can actually provide --

Mr. Gaetz. Are you a high-functioning addict?

The Witness. I think I was until I wasn't.

Mr. Gaetz. And were you a high-functioning addict while you were on the Burisma board?

The Witness. I don't -- not the entire time that I was on the Burisma board, no.

Mr. Gaetz. Were you a high-functioning addict when you were working on the CEFC deal?

The Witness. Yes, probably. But, again --

Mr. Gaetz. Have you ever bribed anyone?

The Witness. No, Mr. Gaetz.

Mr. Gaetz. Have you ever solicited a bribe?

The Witness. No, I've never solicited a bribe.

Mr. Gaetz. And have you ever had anyone solicit a bribe from you?

The Witness. No.

Mr. Gaetz. You work globally, so you're familiar with the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, right?

The Witness. Yes.

Mr. Gaetz. And, under the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, you can actually be guilty of paying a bribe if you pay money to a family member, right?

Mr. Lowell. Excuse me. Are you going to now indulge in a discussion of what the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act does?

Mr. Gaetz. I'm going to ask questions.

Mr. Lowell. Is your background in Foreign Corrupt Practices Act?

Mr. Gaetz. My background is I'm a member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Lowell. I know that, apparently not reading the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act.

Mr. Gaetz. Look, are you familiar with how family member payments can function as bribes, yes or no?

The Witness. I'm generally aware of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act. I have

no specific knowledge of the actual statute. If you'd like to put the statute in front of me, we can read it, and then we can both give you --

Mr. Lowell. That's a great idea. Do we have that? Can you call up the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act so we can do this for real?

Mr. Gaetz. How many LLCs do you manage?

Mr. Lowell. I'm sorry; are you done with the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act?

Mr. Gaetz. Are you done interrupting my questions?

Mr. Lowell. I thought it was in between questions.

Mr. Gaetz. It wasn't.

Mr. Lowell. Okay.

Mr. Gaetz. So let me ask you the question about your LLCs. How many LLCs do you operate?

The Witness. Currently, I operate one LLC.

Mr. Gaetz. And how many have you operated -- did you operate when your father was Vice President?

The Witness. Hold on. I have a list of -- do I have a list of my LLCs? No. Okay. So I know this.

Mr. Gaetz. More than 10?

The Witness. No, definitely not. I know this, is that when I first went into business for myself, I created an LLC. And I believe the first LLC that I created was called Owasco. That would be where my equity would be.

And any businessperson knows that what you do is that you do not do business in your own name. You create a limited liability company registered in a State, and most do in Delaware, Nevada, or other places.

I'm going through the ones -- you just asked me a question.

Mr. Gaetz. I just wanted the number. I don't need a description.

The Witness. I don't have a number off the top of my head.

Mr. Gaetz. You said definitely not more than 10. That answered my question.

So have you ever had a meeting for a real estate investment fund at a Chinese Embassy?

The Witness. How does that answer your question? I don't understand. You asked me how many LLCs I had.

Mr. Gaetz. You don't have to understand my questions.

The Witness. I was going to go through the LLCs I had.

Mr. Gaetz. You just have to answer.

The Witness. I do have to understand your questions. Isn't that the point of asking a question is that the question -- the person who is going to answer it understands it? What do you mean I don't have to understand it?

Mr. Gaetz. Mr. Biden, did you ever have a meeting with your investment fund at the Chinese Embassy?

The Witness. No, I did not have a meeting with my investment fund at the Chinese Embassy that I remember. I know that there was a -- I met the Ambassador, the Chinese Ambassador. I can't remember exactly. Do we have a document you want to show me?

Mr. Gaetz. No, I just have a question to ask you.

The Witness. I just -- I answered it.

Mr. Gaetz. Okay. Do you recall a meeting April 28th at the Chinese Embassy?

Mr. Lowell. What year?

Mr. Gaetz. In 2011.

The Witness. No, I don't recall off the top of my head, but --

Mr. Gaetz. I'm going to mark as exhibit 23 an email, provide a copy to you.

[Biden Exhibit No. 23
was marked for identification.]

The Witness. I had no investment fund in 2011.

Mr. Gaetz. So this purports to be an email from Marvin Lang to you. "Hunter, this is to confirm that the DCM (Minister Deng, pronounced Dung) asked (through a call that I received from Mr. Tao) for you to come to the Chinese Embassy to meet with Minister Deng for half an hour on Thursday, April 28th at 5:40 p.m. (before our dinner)."

Does that refresh your recollection?

The Witness. Yes, I know exactly what this is about.

Mr. Gaetz. Okay. Well, what was the nature of that 30-minute meeting that you had with the Ambassador?

The Witness. Well, to go back to my LLCs, one of the businesses that I had was an investment advisory firm that was licensed with the SEC and which was operated by a woman named Arlene Busch, who had 35 years of experience as an alternative investment adviser, and Eric Schwerin, who's the president of the company. I was the majority equity holder in that company.

And what we did is we advised large institutional alternative investment funds on -- that were seeking capital. And Mr. Lang, Marvin Lang, is a pretty world-renowned hedge fund operator that -- excuse me, a private equity, realty private equity investor that has billions of dollars under management. And he was going -- at that time, like many other people in the world, wanted to create a contact with potentially investors inside of China. And I introduced --

Mr. Lowell. Counsel, you didn't provide this document in advance. Where is it from?

[redacted]. I have no idea.

Mr. Lowell. You have no idea. Okay. I have no idea either. So keep going.

The Witness. But anyway, that's the -- that's the --

Mr. Gaetz. So it was a business meeting at the Chinese Embassy to raise funds for a business venture while your father was Vice President, right?

Mr. Lowell. That is not what he --

The Witness. No, that's not what I said at all. I said that, with Mr. Lang, I had an operating business, which was an alternative investment advisory firm that was operated under the SEC, and a -- and Eric Schwerin, who was licensed with -- as a Series 7, and Arlene Busch who was also, were introducing Mr. Lang to potential investors. Mr. Lang --

Mr. Gaetz. Chinese investors, right, or American investors?

The Witness. No, American investors too. Globally. At that time, if you remember, Mr. Gaetz -- you may not remember, but, at that time, China had said that they were going to begin to invest outside with private money into both alternative investments, infrastructure projects.

It was a big reawakening. It was a new day for China-U.S. relations. And many large institutional investors were seeking potential investors out of the largest country in the world, our biggest trading partner. Everything --

Mr. Gaetz. Didn't it strike you as odd that you're the son of the Vice President and you're having this investment meeting at the Chinese Embassy?

The Witness. They could choose to invest or not. It was Mr. Lang's fund. It wasn't an investment into me. I was a --

Mr. Gaetz. What was the 30-minute meeting about beforehand, before the dinner that's reflected in this?

The Witness. About that.

Mr. Gaetz. Okay. So was that a different subject than was covered at the dinner?

The Witness. No. It was the same issue that was covered at the dinner. I arrived early, and I went to pay my respects to Mr. Deng, who was the Ambassador to -- was he the Ambassador at the time? Minister Deng. I came to pay my respects before the dinner started.

Mr. Gaetz. And so you're saying there was no --

The Witness. It was very traditional.

Mr. Gaetz. -- unique contents in the pre- dinner meeting and the dinner?

The Witness. None whatsoever. And, again, everything China does not have to be somehow criminal behavior. I don't understand, really.

Mr. Gaetz. Did you ever give your dad keys to any office that you had?

The Witness. No, I never did.

Mr. Gaetz. I'd like to mark as exhibit 24 --

Mr. Lowell. Is this an exhibit that we've seen before?

Mr. Gaetz. It's 24.

[Biden Exhibit No. 24
was marked for identification.]

Mr. Lowell. I'd have to see it and take a moment to look over it.

Mr. Gaetz. Of course.

[redacted]. This email I believe has been provided, just in a different format.

Mr. Lowell. So what is it in our -- in what you provided?

[redacted]. We have it in tab 507.

[redacted]. In fairness, though, the agreement was that -- I have no idea --

Mr. Lowell. I understand. We did not hold you to every document, but I see that Mr. Gaetz has a number of documents sitting in front of him. The last time he asked for one, you said you have no idea where it's from.

One of the reasons we get the documents in advance is to see if we believe them to be authentic and have provenance, et cetera. Now I'm just proceeding as you are allowing this to go. Keep going.

[redacted]. Understood. I just wanted to make a note that I mentioned that Members can come with their own documents.

Mr. Lowell. And they apparently have.

Mr. Gaetz. So I guess, does this document refresh your recollection vis-à-vis giving your dad keys to your office?

The Witness. Number one, it does not say that I'm giving keys to my dad. I asked -- and, when my dad left office, I had an office space in Georgetown and -- and at the time -- this is one of the times when I was in active addiction.

My lease was up for renewal, and they were not going to renew my lease. And I said to them, "Look, I'm not going to be the sole person that's in this. I want it for the Biden Foundation, and this could be an office space. It was a beautiful office space. It can be for my mom and my dad."

It never occurred. I didn't get the lease. I was -- I was -- left the office, and no one in my family or anyone else, including myself, ever got a key to the house in Sweden again.

Mr. Gaetz. But it was your plan to have keys for them should that lease be consummated?

The Witness. Literally, as I just said, it was not -- it was -- in my addled brain at the time, it was a way that I was going to redeem myself, is that I was going to show

everybody that I was okay, that I wasn't out of my mind in the midst of addiction, and that what I was going to do is that I was going to get my mom this beautiful corner office that was there, and she would love it, and we'd all be okay, and everything would go back to normal. And my dad was out of office now, and we could all do things as a family.

And it just -- you know, it was pie-in-the-sky ridiculousness. They never took an office. They never got anything, and I didn't -- and I didn't even remain in that office.

Mr. Gaetz. I guess the committee is trying to understand how to parse testimony where you say your father had nothing to do with your business, and then this email, and now your testimony that the way you were going to redeem yourself was by bringing your father into this office space and showing off to your mother how great the corner office was.

The Witness. Understood. So --

Mr. Gaetz. Does that strike you as your intention?

The Witness. -- I guess you're confused --

Mr. Gaetz. I must be.

The Witness. -- about the actual evidence. My dad never took an office space with me.

Mr. Gaetz. No, but you were contemplating it in this email.

Mr. Lowell. I contemplated a lot of things during that time.

Mr. Gaetz. And that's what -- see, because earlier you say, "My father, firewall, nothing to do with my business," and now you're contemplating giving him keys to your office to redeem yourself.

The Witness. How is contemplation -- let me ask a question. How is contemplation of something evidence of involvement? I alone contemplate. I contemplate that one day you and I are going to be great friends. Is that ever going to

happen, Mr. Gaetz? I don't think so.

Mr. Gaetz. Hope springs eternal, Mr. Biden.

The Witness. No. Well, if you keep talking like this, I don't understand how it possibly could, because I don't think you're understanding, and we're not on the same wavelength here. Contemplation is not involvement.

Mr. Gaetz. Right, but it seems to speak against this bright line system. You testified when Mr. Raskin was asking you questions --

The Witness. My dad was out of office. The bright line --

Mr. Gaetz. -- that you had bright lines.

The Witness. My dad was out of office.

Mr. Gaetz. So it's okay to do business with your dad when he's out of office is your testimony?

The Witness. Of course, it would be okay to do business with my dad when he's out of office.

Mr. Gaetz. With the Chinese and with Burisma?

The Witness. This isn't about doing business with Chinese. I wanted it for the Biden Foundation, for it to be housed in the office space that I had. And I just contemplated that.

Mr. Gaetz. It seems like a distinction without a difference.

Mr. Lowell. Stop, sorry. I didn't hear what you just said.

Mr. Gaetz. I'll strike that.

Mr. Lowell. Wait. The Biden Foundation is not a distinction with doing corporate business? Is that what you said?

Mr. Gaetz. No, that's not what I said.

Mr. Lowell. Oh, okay.

Mr. Gaetz. All right. So I'll go to my last exhibit. I think it's 25.

[Biden Exhibit No. 25
was marked for identification.]

The Witness. Can we read it for a second?

Mr. Gaetz. Sure.

Mr. Lowell. The record should show we have not been provided this in advance. It is a multiple-page purported to be some text exchange. I don't understand what XRVision is on the third page or where that indicates it's from.

It has some name that's blotted out in the front, and then the next page there is a red line in the second. So I just need to read this.

The Witness. I have it. I mean, I generally have it, but go ahead. Why is the clock stopped?

Mr. Gaetz. Because we're waiting for you to tell us you're ready to proceed.

Mr. Lowell. The clock is not on when you're reading a new exhibit that you haven't been provided in advance?

[redacted]. We stopped it when you were making your statement about the document.

Mr. Gaetz. So did you send this text message to your daughter?

The Witness. I don't know. Again, I don't know where you got this text message. I sent many text messages to my daughter, but I have no reason to believe that you would -- that -- I don't know, but I'm just reading over it. It's a --

Mr. Gaetz. I'm going to draw your attention to I think it's like the third or fourth paragraph. It starts --

Mr. Lowell. First page?

Mr. Gaetz. Yes, first page. "Sometimes Pop can't help himself. There is

literally not a single brain cell he has used considering what the impact would be on me or you or anyone...his factoring in the family had been simply to gauge whether any of us have screwed up so bad that it would diminish his chances. You cannot say over and over again (and it's true) that there's nothing any of us have done that even impacts the voters -- the voter in the margin and say that how the skeletons of the family may make it hard" --

Mr. Lowell. It doesn't say skeletons.

Mr. Gaetz. It does.

Mr. Lowell. It says Skelton's, capital S's.

Mr. Gaetz. Okay, my apology. "Skelton's of his family may make it hard for him to put us through the ringer in pursuit of the office. It's just pure bullshit. It continues regardless. He's still using that line by proxy. He doesn't say it himself that directly but all of his advisers do."

Do you recall sending that?

The Witness. No, I don't recall sending this. But I can tell you this, Mr. Gaetz. Number one is this: This is me on -- supposed to be me to my daughter, February 22nd, 2019. And I'm literally on a daily basis trying to kill myself.

It had nothing to do with business. It doesn't have anything to do with anything. It's me complaining in every different way, shouting out at the world and literally in complete and utter agony.

And my beautiful daughter is literally trying to save my life and reach out to me. And I go on a tangent and a tirade, and I act like a child, and I say things that I would never, ever, ever, ever want to be read, because they don't resemble anything resembling the truth about the way that I think about my dad, who literally was also at this time trying to save my life. And so I don't know what you're trying to get at here.

Mr. Gaetz. I was just asking if you sent the message. It sounds like you do remember sending it.

My question is --

Mr. Lowell. That's not what he said, Mr. Gaetz.

The Witness. Mr. Lowell --

Mr. Lowell. Literally, no. You can keep stating his testimony for him or let the transcript state his testimony, but don't mischaracterize it.

Mr. Gaetz. Well, it certainly seemed to me like he remembered it.

Mr. Lowell. A lot of things seem things to you that nobody else in this room would seem to be the truth.

Mr. Gaetz. Which advisers are you referencing?

The Witness. Do you have children, Mr. Gaetz?

Mr. Gaetz. What's that?

The Witness. Do you have children?

Mr. Gaetz. It's not about me and my family, Mr. Biden. It's about your --

The Witness. I'm trying to get to the point, Mr. Gaetz.

Mr. Gaetz. I'm asking you a question about which advisors you're referencing.

The Witness. If you had a private message in your worst moment with your child --

Mr. Gaetz. Is this a private message you sent in your worst moment?

The Witness. How does it have anything to do with --

Mr. Gaetz. I want to know which advisers you're talking about who were warning you that your corrupt activities might have impacted your father negatively.

The Witness. Again, I apologize. I don't want you to get emotional about this, because I'm not. And I apologize, I really truly do.

Is that I cannot verify the forensic certainty of this message because you have not provided me with any forensic certainty. I do not know whether it was manipulated or not. I don't know if one word was added or another was taken out. I can't -- and neither can you and neither can anyone.

And that's the point, because I do know other text messages were manipulated. I do know that we know for certain that there's a guy named -- that there's a guy named Smirnov, who is going out and making up lies. There's a guy named Gal Luft who is going out and making up lies.

Mr. Gaetz. You've exceeded the scope of the question, Mr. Biden. And I only have another moment. So --

The Witness. I'm answering it in full. Yeah.

Mr. Gaetz. So did any of your father's advisers speak to you about your conduct being problematic for his political ambitions?

The Witness. No.

Mr. Gaetz. Never?

The Witness. Never.

Mr. Gaetz. Those are my questions.

[3:05 p.m.]

Ms. Hageman. Mr. Biden, Harriet Hageman from the State of Wyoming.

The Witness. Nice to meet you, Congresswoman.

Ms. Hageman. Can you hear me okay down there? Can the court reporters, can you hear me okay?

The Reporter. I can.

Ms. Hageman. Harriet Hageman, H-a-g-e-m-a-n, State of Wyoming.

I have a couple of questions I would like to go over with you, and they're going to be some of them that are sensitive. I'm not asking you these questions to embarrass you or cause you any heartache. I'm asking questions because I think that the timeline that we're dealing with here is very, very important.

You have repeatedly pointed to your education, your background, your history, your experience, and your resume as the basis for your qualifications to work for Burisma, the richest man in China, Romania, et cetera, correct?

The Witness. Yes.

Ms. Hageman. Okay.

You also stated, I believe in your book, that you had a raging crack cocaine addiction during the same period of time that you were working for those companies, from 2003 to 2019. Is that also correct?

The Witness. No, not completely, not the entirety of the time. And if you read the book, it provides a general timeline of when the acute addiction to crack began and ended.

Ms. Hageman. But I believe that in the book it was around 2003 was when it began, into 2019; you've been in recovery since then. Is that fair?

The Witness. Not even remotely close.

Ms. Hageman. Okay. Can you tell me the timeline then?

The Witness. No, I cannot tell you the exact timeline, but I didn't ever use crack in 2003. My -- I began, I think -- it says it in the book -- I think sometime in 2016 or so.

Ms. Hageman. Okay. You've confirmed that -- those addictions today, correct?

Mr. Lowell. Which addictions are you talking about, ma'am?

Ms. Hageman. That you had a crack cocaine addiction today, correct, you've confirmed that?

Mr. Lowell. Congresswoman, he has made a long statement saying when he was high-functioning, not high-functioning, his areas of sobriety --

Ms. Hageman. I would rather that you not testify on his behalf. He can either tell me whether I'm correct or not. We'll just have him answer the questions, okay?

The Witness. What's the -- okay, Ms. --

Ms. Hageman. Thank you.

The Witness. -- Congresswoman. I got it. What's the question?

Ms. Hageman. Okay.

The Witness. Sorry.

Ms. Hageman. So what I want to find out is that, during some period of time that you were working for these various companies, you had addictions. You've confirmed that today, correct?

The Witness. Yes. I think the most acute addiction that I had was alcoholism at that time.

Ms. Hageman. All right. So, between alcoholism and crack cocaine, you have these addictions during the period of time that you were working for these companies, correct?

The Witness. Not the entirety of the time, but some of the work that I did --

Ms. Hageman. Well, I would also say that we are familiar with the laptop, and you've indicated that you believe that there are some things on there --

The Witness. I'm sorry. What --

Ms. Hageman. -- that are not accurate.

The Witness. Okay. I'm sorry. What laptop?

Ms. Hageman. The laptop that was dropped off with the person in Delaware that is --

The Witness. Have you --

Ms. Hageman. -- the subject of your lawsuit.

The Witness. Have you seen that laptop?

Ms. Hageman. Pardon me?

The Witness. Have you actually seen that laptop?

Ms. Hageman. Well, no, but I've seen things from it.

The Witness. No, I know. But I'm asking you, have you seen the actual laptop?

Ms. Hageman. No, I haven't. But I don't think for purposes --

The Witness. Does anyone know the existence of an --

Ms. Hageman. Mr. Biden --

The Witness. -- actual laptop?

Ms. Hageman. Mr. Biden, for purposes of my questioning today, I do not need to --

The Witness. I'm sorry --

Ms. Hageman. -- have the physical laptop in front of me. If you cannot answer my questions, please say so and we will move on.

The Witness. Ms. Hageman, I'm not being -- I'm not in any way --

Ms. Hageman. So --

The Witness. I'm sorry. I'm trying to answer the question. I've never --

Ms. Hageman. All right.

The Witness. I've never --

Ms. Hageman. Well, but I would like you to focus on answering my questions.

So, in terms of what we have seen with some of the photographs, the information from the laptop, the information from your book, I would say that I don't believe that that represents someone who would be responsible and considered a professional for handling multimillion-dollar international deals focused on corporate governance.

Would you agree with that?

The Witness. Again, I think that addiction is a very difficult thing to be able to define. I think that there are moments in time where you could be fully competent. I think that there are a lot of people around this room who suffer from alcoholism that are still in this room and that they're still functioning.

Ms. Hageman. Then let me ask the question this way, Mr. Biden --

The Witness. Just by virtue -- I'm answering the question --

Ms. Hageman. Mr. Biden --

The Witness. -- Ms. Hageman.

Ms. Hageman. -- you're not answering my question.

The Witness. I promise you --

Ms. Hageman. You're filibustering.

The Witness. -- I'm answering the question.

Ms. Hageman. So here's my question. In terms --

The Witness. I don't know why you're being so hostile. I'm trying --

Ms. Hageman. In terms of your qualifications and expertise, did you tell your

handlers and the people that you worked with at Burisma, the Chinese company, et cetera, of your addictions?

Mr. Lowell. What do you mean about "handlers"?

Ms. Hageman. People that you worked with at Burisma --

The Witness. Oh, you call them handlers? Do you have handlers?

Ms. Hageman. No, but I think you do.

The Witness. Well, that's -- that's --

Ms. Hageman. So let's go ahead --

The Witness. -- I guess that's your opinion.

Ms. Hageman. But I'll restate the question, Mr. Biden.

The Witness. I'm trying to answer your question.

Ms. Hageman. Let me restate the question because --

Mr. Lowell. Congresswoman, I don't want --

Ms. Hageman. -- your attorney apparently doesn't like --

Mr. Lowell. -- to interrupt, but if you're going to ask a question, please let him answer your question before you interrupt him.

Ms. Hageman. You interrupted me. So I'm --

Mr. Lowell. So let's not interrupt --

Ms. Hageman. -- restating the question.

Mr. Lowell. -- each other anymore. That's a deal?

Ms. Hageman. That's a deal.

Mr. Lowell. Okay.

Ms. Hageman. All right.

So my question for you is: In terms of your qualifications and expertise, did you tell the folks at Burisma, the Chinese company, Romania, et cetera, of your alcohol and

drug addiction?

The Witness. I don't remember if anyone -- I actually told anyone directly about that. But it was -- at the end, it was fairly obvious that I had a problem.

Ms. Hageman. Okay. So you don't -- "at the end." What do you mean by "at the end"?

The Witness. Before I got sober.

Ms. Hageman. And when would that be?

The Witness. Again, I feel like I have to explain what addiction is.

Ms. Hageman. You don't have to explain addiction. I'm asking for dates.

The Witness. Okay. I don't have -- because if you understood addiction, you don't have necessarily dates. The one date that you remember is this: You remember the day that you quit, and you remember the day that you first started when you were 11 years old and you had your first drink. You don't remember all the times in between in which you weren't an addict, in which you got sober, in which you tried to get sober, in which you had long stretches of sobriety during that period of time.

And, I mean, everybody knows this. Everybody has someone that they love that's gone through this. It's --

Ms. Hageman. Mr. Biden --

The Witness. I'm answering your question.

Ms. Hageman. -- I'm using your terminology.

The Witness. I'm really trying to answer your question.

Ms. Hageman. You said "at the end." I said, what did you mean by "at the end"?

The Witness. "At the end"?

Ms. Hageman. Yes.

The Witness. The date that I know that I stopped using drugs and alcohol.

Ms. Hageman. And when was that?

The Witness. That date was officially, I think -- not "I think" -- is June 1st.

Ms. Hageman. Of what year?

The Witness. 2019.

Ms. Hageman. Well, you've testified today that you were serving on the board of Burisma in a transparent and ethical way, to quote from you, and that you were providing oversight and accountability in corporate governance, again quoting from you.

Don't you believe that you had a fiduciary responsibility to inform Burisma and the other folks that you were working with --

The Witness. Okay.

Ms. Hageman. -- about your addiction?

The Witness. Thank you for your question. And I would ask this question: Do you think that every colleague of yours or anyone that works for you that's an alcoholic -- which I can guarantee you, at least 30 percent of the people that you serve with suffer from alcoholism; they're either in recovery or active addiction.

Do you think it's incumbent upon them, if they suffer from alcoholism, that they immediately resign?

Ms. Hageman. That wasn't my question.

The Witness. Well, I'm answering --

Ms. Hageman. Would you please read back my question?

The Witness. That is how -- that is exactly how I'm answering the question.

Ms. Hageman. Oh, can't read back the question. Well, then I'll state it again.

The Witness. And I will say this: is that I have a fiduciary responsibility to do my job based upon that. It is not necessarily that because you're an alcoholic or

because you're an addict, whether you're in recovery or otherwise, that you need to leave your job.

Ms. Hageman. I didn't ask whether you had to leave your job.

The Witness. Fiduciary responsibility.

Ms. Hageman. I asked whether you had a fiduciary responsibility --

The Witness. Of course. Any board member --

Ms. Hageman. -- to provide any notice --

The Witness. -- has a fiduciary responsibility.

Ms. Hageman. Please let me ask the question.

The Witness. Okay. I'm sorry.

Ms. Hageman. Did you have a fiduciary responsibility to tell them of your addiction?

The Witness. I had a fiduciary responsibility to complete the work that they required of me at the times that I did the work.

Ms. Hageman. And that is what you -- and you're, again, an expert in oversight and accountability in corporate governance?

The Witness. Yes.

Ms. Hageman. And you're not aware of what your fiduciary responsibilities would be?

The Witness. I never said that I wasn't aware of my fiduciary responsibility. I'm saying that addiction is something that is not necessarily pinned to a time. It's transient. During that period of time which I served on the board, I was constantly in recovery and constantly failing and constantly back in recovery and constantly failing. It was not a secret.

I had been in recovery since 2003, Ms. Hageman, and I'm trying to answer your

question. In that period of time, I had gone through long stretches of sobriety. They knew when I went to a -- my business partners knew when I went to rehabs. And I went to over a dozen rehabs towards the end there. They all knew that. I had to pay for it out of the insurance from Rosemont Seneca. All my partners there knew it. Rob Walker knew it. James Gilliar knew it. All of the people that I worked with -- Devon Archer knew it. They all knew. And there were other people that knew.

And like people that are alcoholics or addicts, is that you can either make a go of hoping that they get better or you can say, we no longer want you to serve based on this. In my instance, they hoped that I would -- that I was -- recovery would stick.

Ms. Hageman. Does the "they" include your fellow members or anybody employed by Burisma or some of the other companies or countries that you worked for?

The Witness. Yes.

Mr. Lowell. Countries? I'm sorry, what countries are you testifying to?

Ms. Hageman. Romania.

The Witness. I never worked for Romania.

Ms. Hageman. Okay.

The Witness. No, no, no, no, no, no. Not "okay." I never worked for a country. I am not Jared Kushner. I never got money from a country. Not one foreign government ever gave me money, guys -- none, zero, not one.

Ms. Hageman. Then let me re-ask the question.

The Witness. Yes?

Ms. Hageman. Were the folks at Burisma, were they aware of your addiction?

The Witness. Yes. Devon Archer was fully aware of my addiction, and he was fully aware of my attempts to get in recovery. And --

Ms. Hageman. But then what about the gentleman --

The Witness. I'm trying to answer the question, Ms. Hageman.

Ms. Hageman. What about the gentleman from China? Was he aware of your addiction?

The Witness. I really thought we weren't going to interrupt each other. I'm telling you. Yes, he was, because the -- because I was on the board, and Devon Archer was on that board. James Thornton -- I mean, excuse me, James Bulger was also on that board. They knew that I suffered from addiction; they knew that I was in recovery. And each one of them knew.

Ms. Hageman. And how did this addiction manifest itself in terms of your ability to function at your job in what you were doing?

The Witness. Over the course of the time of my addiction, it manifested itself in many different ways. Sometimes it was completely debilitating. Sometimes I could function higher than, I felt like, when I was sober. Sometimes it made me feel like I could do anything, and sometimes it made me feel like I could do nothing. It's the nature of addiction. It's the nature of drug addiction. And sometimes it kills you, and sometimes you're dead.

Ms. Hageman. And you were suffering from these kinds of issues at the very time that you were working for and on the board of, say, again, Burisma, as an example?

The Witness. Could you repeat the question for me?

Ms. Hageman. Yes. You were suffering from these problems during the very period of time that you were on the board of directors for Burisma, for example, correct?

The Witness. I was suffering from addiction -- as I said to you before, the first moment I took a drink, I would categorize myself as an alcoholic and an addict, and --

Ms. Hageman. And then --

The Witness. -- that began with my first drink when I was 11 years old. During

that period of time, I have gone between recovery and otherwise.

Right now, I'm sure you are happy to hear, is that I am clean and sober. I've been clean and sober since June 1st of 2019, and I remain so today.

And I hope and pray on a daily basis and give gratitude to the fact that I have a -- I have regained my life, every single morning that I wake up. And I hope to remain sober for the rest of my life.

But all I know is this --

Ms. Hageman. Mr. Biden --

The Witness. -- I have today --

Ms. Hageman. Mr. Biden, during the period of time --

The Witness. -- and I'm not going to drink today, and I'm not going to use today.

Ms. Hageman. During the period of time that you were working for Burisma was also the time that coincided with your father being Vice President of the United States, correct?

The Witness. Yes.

[redacted]. Mr. Biggs?

Mr. Biggs. Thank you.

Thanks for being here today, Mr. Biden.

And I would just say, I'm going to ask him to answer the questions. If he doesn't know or understand the question, he is free to consult with you, and I'm --

Mr. Lowell. That's not the way it works, Congressman, but give it your best shot.

Mr. Biggs. That's the way --

The Witness. I'm going to ask him to jump in when it's appropriate for him to jump in --

Mr. Biggs. That's right. Okay.

The Witness. -- because he's my legal counsel.

Mr. Biggs. Yeah. That's what I'm saying.

Mr. Lowell. You ask a bad question, I'm going to ask you to clarify it.

Mr. Biggs. I want to ask you about exhibit 12.

The Witness. Thank you. Exhibit 12.

Mr. Biggs. So, when you get to exhibit 12, this is a series of text messages here -- emails, I should say.

The Witness. Yeah.

Mr. Biggs. And I just want to make sure I understand this, because one of the items mentioned in here is, "US publicly or in private communication/comment expressing their 'positive opinion'" -- this is what BS was supposed to do -- "and support of Nikolay/Burisma to the highest level of decision makers here in Ukraine: President of Ukraine, president Chief of staff, Prosecutor General, etc."

Who was the Prosecutor General at that time, if you know?

The Witness. I don't -- I don't know --

Mr. Biggs. Okay.

The Witness. -- who the Prosecutor General was at that time. November 2nd, 2015. I'm not sure.

Mr. Biggs. Okay.

Tell me about Devon. How long have you known Devon Archer?

The Witness. I have known Devon since, I think, 2007, '08. Maybe earlier, maybe 2006.

Mr. Biggs. Fifteen years or more, probably something like that?

The Witness. Yes.

Mr. Biggs. And he's been your -- an active business partner at various

enterprises over the years, I assume?

The Witness. Not necessarily business partner, but Devon and I tried to -- attempted to do business together. We were closely integrated. We tried to do a lot of business together, yes.

Mr. Biggs. And Mr. Archer currently is -- he's been convicted. He's awaiting -- I think he's trying to appeal, but he's also due to report to the Bureau of Prisons sometime fairly soon.

The Witness. Yeah, that's true.

Mr. Biggs. And that's something that has arisen out of something, I think, that is often referred to as the Indian bond scheme. Are you familiar with that?

The Witness. I'm familiar that he was indicted and is going to be serving a prison sentence soon.

Mr. Biggs. Regarding the Indian bond scheme?

The Witness. No, I have no knowledge of an Indian bond scheme. But I've read the --

Mr. Biggs. Are you familiar with a company called Burnham?

The Witness. I am.

Mr. Biggs. And did you have any active participation in Burnham, either as an equity holder, director, or officer?

The Witness. No. I don't think that ever came to fruition. I think that there was a proposal that I'd be a part of that, but it all fell apart in all of this.

Mr. Biggs. And so you never actually had any relationship to -- of those who were in Burnham trying to use the pension funds to --

The Witness. No.

Mr. Biggs. Okay.

And you're familiar with Jason Galanis, John Galanis, Frank Galanis, Devon, and others?

The Witness. No. I know the name because it's been reported in the press. I think that 10 years ago for 30 minutes I was introduced to Jason Galanis, and that's only -- the only time I ever recall meeting him.

Mr. Biggs. So 10 years ago for 30 minutes. Okay.

The Witness. Yeah.

Mr. Biggs. Very good.

Now I want to go back to Devon Archer again for another second. The Dubai telephone call that you indicated you did not call your father, but when Devon testified for us, in front of us, he talked about this meeting that was had. And there was -- I think there was a dinner meeting. It was you, and it was Zlochevsky, the secretary of Burisma, and Devon were all dining at a hotel in Dubai.

Does that sound familiar?

The Witness. Yes.

Mr. Biggs. And Devon's testimony is that there was discussion about the problems that Zlochevsky was having with Shokin and the Prosecutor General of Ukraine.

The Witness. I think that the transcript specifically said "pressures in general."

Mr. Biggs. "Pressures in general."

The Witness. Yeah.

Mr. Biggs. Yeah. He indicated pretty clearly that it was coming from within Ukraine.

Do you -- do you remember that?

Mr. Lowell. I'm sorry. Can you read that one, please?

Mr. Biggs. Do you remember that?

No, we're not going to read -- we don't have time to read it. Let's go. Let's --

Mr. Lowell. Well, then don't characterize it unless you're willing to show us the place that you are referring to.

Mr. Biggs. Then you can look at it. You can look at it later.

Here's what we're talking about. Here's what we're talking about. Do you remember the dinner --

The Witness. I would rather look at it after you ask me the question about it so I --

Mr. Biggs. You've already looked at it once.

The Witness. Mr. Biggs, there are literally 2,000 -- 8,000 pages of documents you've given me. I've looked at over 27 exhibits today --

Mr. Biggs. This is earlier today.

The Witness. -- over 400 pages that you've given me --

Mr. Biggs. Let's answer the question.

The Witness. -- and you want me to recall?

Mr. Biggs. Let's answer the question.

The Witness. Okay. I'll answer the question.

Mr. Biggs. I think you can answer the question.

The Witness. Okay.

Mr. Biggs. And that is: You had a dinner. Those were the people who were at the dinner that I just mentioned, right?

The Witness. I don't recall the actual dinner. I know that if we had a dinner, the dinner most likely was with the entire board. And every other board meeting, if we went to dinner afterwards, it would be the four to five board members and some of the senior management, including Nikolay.

Mr. Biggs. So you had a dinner. You think it's bigger than Devon testified to, but that's fine.

The Witness. Yeah, I don't recall exactly. Yeah.

Mr. Biggs. But I am under the impression, listening to you right now --

The Witness. Yeah.

Mr. Biggs. -- that you don't specifically remember a dinner where Zlochevsky was saying to you, I need some help, and you left and maybe made a call to Washington, D.C.?

The Witness. It's not that I don't remember that. I can say emphatically that I never, ever, ever picked up the phone to call my dad to tell him to do anything --

Mr. Biggs. So -- so --

The Witness. -- on behalf of Burisma.

Mr. Biggs. I didn't ask that question, though, did I?

The Witness. Well, I thought you did.

Mr. Biggs. I said you called Washington, D.C.

The Witness. I don't recall calling Washington, D.C.

Mr. Biggs. So your testimony is contradictory to Devon's. Is that fair to say?

The Witness. I would say that my memory is definitely contradictory to Devon's as it relates to 9 years ago, a dinner and a phone call that he was not a party to.

So Devon testified -- and this is why it's important that we have the transcript in front of us, Mr. Biggs.

Mr. Biggs. Yeah. Yeah, yeah.

The Witness. It is important to have the transcript in front of us, because he does not say that he was a witness to that phone call. What he says is that I walked away from the table, and what he assumed was that I called D.C.

Well, Devon's assumption was wrong. I did not call D.C. --

Mr. Biggs. Who did you call then?

The Witness. I could've called my -- my -- my wife. I could've called my -- anybody.

Mr. Biggs. You don't remember who you called?

The Witness. I have no idea about a phone call or otherwise. And neither does Devon Archer, because he wasn't there. He self-admittedly was not there to witness a phone call.

Mr. Biggs. Right.

So what we're getting at is -- you're telling us you can remember everything else about that --

The Witness. I did not say I remember. I don't even remember the dinner.

Mr. Biggs. You don't remember? Well, then why are you testifying about it? Then why didn't you just say, "I can't remember it"?

The Witness. Because --

Mr. Lowell. Because you asked him the question.

The Witness. -- you asked me the question, and Devon said that there was a dinner. I'm saying that I don't have any reason to believe that there wasn't a dinner, because at every board meeting, on every night that we were on a board meeting, we would have dinner together. So was there a dinner? Of course.

And so I'm testifying that all I know is this: I don't recall a phone call. I know there was never a phone call to my father. I can say that under oath.

Mr. Biggs. Okay.

The Witness. And, finally, is this: is that I also know, by the testimony under oath of Devon Archer, he says he was not a witness to the phone call.

Mr. Biggs. Right.

So you also testified that the book -- that the book was wrong, your book was wrong, it's printed with the wrong date. You testified that --

Mr. Lowell. No, no. Actually, it was right.

The Witness. Oh, it was right?

Mr. Biggs. But that's not what he testified to, Mr. Lowell.

Mr. Lowell. He said he wasn't sure.

The Witness. I wasn't sure. I thought because --

Mr. Biggs. No, no. Well, we'll have the transcript to look back. I mean, you like to rely on the transcript.

Mr. Lowell. Well, luckily we're still here, so let's ask the question: When is the date that is in his book in which he's talking about? It's either 2013 or 2014.

Is that the one you're talking about?

Mr. Biggs. Yeah.

Mr. Lowell. Let's go back to the book.

The Witness. Yeah.

Mr. Lowell. Can we go back to that exhibit?

The Witness. But regardless is this: is that, I'm sorry I missed, in a 270-page book, a typo of -- if it is such a typo. I have no idea.

Mr. Lowell. What is the 2013 date?

Mr. Biggs. Unbelievable.

The Witness. How is it unbelievable, Mr. Biggs? I really don't understand.

Mr. Biggs. Well, I'm not surprised you don't understand, so --

The Witness. Why are you not surprised? I really -- is that --

Mr. Biggs. So here we go. Do you have the book?

Mr. Lowell. Yeah, we do.

Mr. Biggs. Okay. What's the right year?

Mr. Lowell. "In 2013, Dad asked my then-teenage daughter, Finnegan, to join him on Air Force Two to Japan" --

The Witness. So this isn't even -- we're not even talking about the same time. This is the -- this is the transcript. I thought that that 2013 -- I was confused. I thought that it happened in --

Mr. Biggs. So you're --

The Witness. -- 2014. But --

Mr. Biggs. I don't want to interrupt you, but I'm going to. You are confused -- you were confused earlier today --

The Witness. About your --

Mr. Biggs. -- when you testified?

The Witness. By your questioning. You're telling me -- you were just talking about a board meeting with Burisma in Dubai.

Mr. Biggs. Yeah, and then we moved on to this.

The Witness. Oh. We hadn't even moved on to it yet, though. What's --

Mr. Biggs. Yeah, we had.

The Witness. -- the question?

Mr. Biggs. You said this morning -- I want to make this as clear as I possibly can. This morning, you testified, my understanding, that your book was in error. In fact, I wrote it down when you said that, that the date was in error --

The Witness. No --

Mr. Biggs. -- in your published book. Is that -- was that wrong?

The Witness. If we -- we will, I'm sure, have the transcript in 24 hours. But to

clarify, I will make absolutely clear, we were doing questioning here. We were asking other questions related to other dates. There have been many, many dates thrown around today. I think probably a thousand times someone has asked me about a date, time, this, this, and the other.

Mr. Biggs. This was --

The Witness. When I was reading this, it said in 2013, and I said, "Is that right?"

Mr. Biggs. Okay.

The Witness. "I'm not sure if that's right. I thought the trip to China occurred in 2014."

Mr. Biggs. All right.

The Witness. I'm still not certain of exactly the date that it happened. But it's not a --

Mr. Biggs. You don't view it as materiality. I get it.

The Witness. Whether it happened in 2013 or 2014?

Mr. Biggs. So I want to -- I want to ask you --

The Witness. Do you view that as materiality?

Mr. Lowell. I'm sorry. Now we have to tell you that you're over your hour, and I've given you 2 or 3 more minutes. And I'm just -- according to Ms. Greene, rules matter.

Mr. Biggs. Thank you.

Mr. Lowell. We're done.

Mr. Biggs. I want to ask you one more question, though, with regard to the messages --

Mr. Lowell. I guess not.

The Witness. I guess not.

Mr. Biggs. -- yeah -- with regard to the messages, which are apparently -- they look like photos of screenshots of a BlackBerry, right? Roughly speaking. You've seen a number of --

The Witness. That's what I'm told that they are.

Mr. Biggs. Yeah.

The Witness. By your own admission, correct?

Mr. Biggs. Yeah.

The Witness. Yeah.

Mr. Biggs. Well, the reason I'm asking about that --

The Witness. Yeah?

Mr. Biggs. -- is because you went ahead and answered questions about those as if the contents of those were accurate. For instance, the conversation between Gilliar and Bobulinski, et cetera.

And I assume, then, that you were accepting, with some modest amount of skepticism, the veracity --

Mr. Lowell. Actually, I made an objection and said that because it is not authentic and it is not complete and we don't know what it was, I put that on the record so somebody like you couldn't do what you just did. And I said I will allow him to answer questions with the premise that we don't know that they were authentic or complete. And you can go back to the transcript on that as well.

Mr. Biggs. Yeah. Do you --

The Witness. Tony didn't turn over his phone.

Mr. Biggs. I'll let you ask him that. But let me --

The Witness. I don't think he's talking to me.

Mr. Lowell. They're not on talking terms anymore.

Mr. Biggs. Yeah. It looked like they weren't on talking terms early on either.

But the question ultimately boils down to this: Do you question the veracity of those communications, of those evidence?

The Witness. I absolutely -- I question the veracity of anything that comes from Tony Bobulinski, including a photograph of a screenshot of a broken phone from 9 years ago, or 6 years ago, or 4 years ago, or whatever it is. I absolutely question the veracity of everything that comes out of Tony Bobulinski's mouth.

Mr. Biggs. So your position is that those are not accurate at all?

The Witness. No, I did not say that. I question and feel that I have the right to question the veracity of anything that comes from Tony Bobulinski based on this:

Tony Bobulinski has a 302 in which his account of it is absolutely different from the six FBI agents who took notes during that, in which they say he said he was at a meeting in Miami that he was not at. That's why -- one of the reasons.

I also have a problem with Tony Bobulinski's veracity because Mr. Bobulinski gave in to you and said that he never had a meeting with Mark Meadows at a rally for President Trump and wore a ski mask. And it seems as if Ms. Hutchinson came up with a picture of Mr. Bobulinski in a ski mask at a rally for Mr. Trump.

That's why I question the veracity of anything that Tony Bobulinski has said, among other things.

[redacted]. We're at time.

[redacted]. We're up for our time.

Mr. Jordan. Mr. Biden, I think we have one Member with one other question. I understand the scope and the rules. Would you be willing to allow --

The Witness. And that's it, we're done?

Mr. Jordan. -- Mr. Fallon to ask a question?

The Witness. I know, but is that -- are we done for the day?

[redacted]. Why don't we turn around and let the Democrats go and --

The Witness. No, if we're done for the day -- we had intended this to have three rounds.

[Crosstalk.]

Mr. Lowell. Hold on. Hold on. Hold on.

We had intended, as the agreement says, to have three rounds. We're going to let -- we let this go further than your last round's time. That's fine. If you have another Member to do that --

Mr. Jordan. We have a couple Members with a question.

Mr. Lowell. Let's do that, but then I want to talk to counsel about when we're going to conclude this.

Mr. Jordan. Fair enough. I understand.

Mr. Fallon. Very short questions.

Mr. Lowell. Okay.

Mr. Jordan. And do we want to allow -- I think we should -- our hour is up -- let the Democrats go, and we have a couple more questions from Republicans.

[redacted]. Yeah, we want to let the Democrats ask their questions, if they have questions.

Mr. Lowell. No, you said you have a couple of Republicans.

[redacted]. We do, but --

[redacted]. If you guys have a few more to wrap up, I think you guys can go ahead.

[redacted]. Yeah, I don't think we're going to have --

Mr. Lowell. If this is the wrap-up, yes.

Mr. Raskin. We're not going to have many questions at all.

[redacted]. But if you need a break --

The Witness. No.

Mr. Lowell. We don't need a break.

The Witness. Let's wrap it up.

Mr. Lowell. Majority members -- oh, you have one? Please.

Mr. Fallon. Just a couple, yeah.

Mr. Lowell. Please, go ahead.

Mr. Fallon. Thank you.

Mr. Biden, just as far as addiction goes, my father was an alcoholic for 30 years. He passed away 2 years ago. His best 30 years were his last 30, when he conquered it in '92. So I'm very sympathetic with --

The Witness. Appreciate that.

Mr. Fallon. -- your plight.

The Witness. Yeah.

Mr. Fallon. And I did think it was rather demeaning for a colleague across the aisle to say that, in questioning you or bringing this up, trying to investigate, that we want to force you into -- push you into relapse. I think that's just beyond the pale, and that's exactly the opposite of what any of us want.

Mr. Raskin. But I was quoting a prior witness who said that.

Mr. Fallon. Okay.

Mr. Raskin. We can read the transcript back to you.

Mr. Fallon. That's fine.

So you said at 11:59 a.m. today that "the purpose of my life is to be an example for others" and that you have to make amends. And being familiar via my dad with

atonement and amends, in 2014 -- which is an important part of the 12-step process -- in 2014, did you pay your taxes in full?

Mr. Lowell. I'm sorry, Congressman. One of the areas that is part of our agreement is that you're not going to be able to have him address issues that are a subject to litigation that is occurring. And, consequently --

Mr. Fallon. Counsel, I believe that's a --

Mr. Lowell. I am sorry. Let me finish --

Mr. Fallon. Okay. Go ahead.

Mr. Lowell. -- my point, because this is something I specifically talked to your counsels about.

So, if you want to ask him how much money he made, if you want to ask him how he made his money, if you want to ask him any questions about the underlying facts, that's fine.

If you're asking him about when he paid his taxes, how he paid his taxes, whether or not he ever bought a gun, whether he didn't buy a gun, that's outside the scope of our agreement.

Mr. Fallon. In 2014, this is -- that's beyond the statute of limitations.

Mr. Lowell. And your point is?

Mr. Fallon. So he cannot be -- he cannot be tried for that. So --

Mr. Lowell. I'm not doing this on the basis or whether or not he could or could not be charged, because your view of the statute of limitations is not something I can take to court, I bet. I will tell you, though, that it's part of the agreement that we made.

Ask him about what he made. Ask him about how he made it. Ask him --

Mr. Fallon. Well, I -- okay. So --

Mr. Lowell. -- about what he did with his money.

Mr. Fallon. All right, counsel, I get it. I get it.

Mr. Lowell. But if you're asking him about taxes --

Mr. Fallon. You're not going to direct my inquiry. I understand.

So I'm just saying that if someone is outside the statute of limitations, you're not going to be tried for it, but there were back taxes owed, part of that amends or atonement would be to pay those taxes. I think that would be moral.

Mr. Lowell. Is that your statement, or is that a question?

Mr. Fallon. Both.

Would you agree with that?

The Witness. My intention in everything that I do is to make amends for where I hold responsibility and make good where I can.

Mr. Fallon. Okay. Thank you.

Would you agree -- I think we can agree on a lot of this stuff -- that it's a fact that your dad became Vice President of the United States January 20th, 2009?

The Witness. I would agree with that.

Mr. Fallon. Okay. That part of his portfolio with the --

The Witness. I also agree that he became President on January 20th, 2020, which I think a number of you don't agree with.

Mr. Fallon. I didn't like to see it, but I agree it happened.

The Witness. Yeah. Okay.

Mr. Fallon. It's a fact that part of his portfolio as Vice President in the Obama administration was Ukraine? Would --

The Witness. Yes.

Mr. Fallon. -- you agree on that? Okay.

That Burisma, as you mentioned -- and I think we agree on this, because you had it

in your testimony -- that it's a large energy company in Ukraine? In fact, you stated it was one of the two largest.

The Witness. Yes.

Mr. Fallon. Okay. That that same energy company hired you on the board for, I think you said, roughly $65,000 a month for 5 years was the original agreement?

The Witness. Yes.

Mr. Fallon. Okay.

It's a fact that, in 2015, U.S. Ambassador Geoffrey Pyatt gave a speech in Odessa where he talked about corruption and that he by name mentioned Mykola Zlochevsky?

The Witness. That who did? Oh, that Pyatt? Yes.

Mr. Fallon. Geoffrey Pyatt.

The Witness. Yes. Yes.

Mr. Fallon. And Zlochevsky, for the record, was the -- was he the head of Burisma, the CEO?

The Witness. Yes.

Mr. Fallon. Okay.

And then the fact that Viktor Shokin was a Ukrainian prosecutor, we agree on that?

The Witness. Yes.

Mr. Fallon. He was investigating Zlochevsky?

The Witness. I do not --

Mr. Fallon. Whether or not you think he did it well, he was investigating Zlochevsky?

The Witness. I do not know whether he was investigating Zlochevsky.

Mr. Fallon. Okay.

That it's a fact that the Vice President, your dad, advocated for Shokin's firing? He gave a speech indicating that he wanted him fired and that he indeed got him fired?

The Witness. I think that that is public knowledge, yes.

Mr. Fallon. Public record. All right.

And it's a fact that Shokin was fired. It's a fact that, since he was fired, Zlochevsky was never investigated again and he was charged with no crimes?

So we agree on all that?

The Witness. Yes.

Mr. Fallon. Okay. Do you see how that could be viewed as a conflict of interest?

The Witness. As I pointed out before, is that one of the things that, in everything that I do, every area that my father has influence over, which is almost ubiquitous, is that I try to minimize the conflict that there could possibly be.

And the way that I did that was, number one, making certain that I never had any discussions with my father or anyone in his administration or asking them to do things on my behalf --

Mr. Fallon. The best way --

The Witness. -- for my -- for the benefit --

Mr. Fallon. I'm sorry. I apologize.

The Witness. -- yeah -- for the benefit of anyone that I was working for or any board that I was serving on.

Mr. Fallon. I think the best way to avoid that conflict would've been not to take the job at all.

Mr. Lowell. He didn't say it was a conflict.

Mr. Swalwell. Thank you for sharing.

Mr. Fallon. Would we agree that, in February of 2014, Yelena Baturina, the wife of the former mayor of Moscow, gave $3.5 million to the companies you were involved with?

Mr. Lowell. No, wait, wait. I'm sorry. Last piece? Companies he was involved with?

Mr. Fallon. You want me to get the --

The Witness. No, I got it. It's --

Mr. Fallon. Rosemont Partners, Seneca --

The Witness. Yeah. Listen, I had nothing to do with Rosemont-whatever entity, the realty or whatever it is. That was Devon's. I never received a dime from Ms. Baturina. I didn't have any involvement with her in any way.

Mr. Fallon. Okay.

The Witness. That was Devon's relationship. And I think that she made an investment into, according to Devon, into actual commercial property --

Mr. Fallon. Okay. So I can rephrase the question. She gave $3.5 million to Devon Archer, one of your --

The Witness. She did not give $3.5 million to --

Mr. Fallon. Invested -- whatever -- wired, transferred --

The Witness. I know, but the words matter.

Mr. Fallon. Okay.

The Witness. They really do matter --

Mr. Fallon. Wired --

The Witness. -- because no one was given anything for not anything --

Mr. Fallon. Well, that's what you said.

The Witness. According to Devon, in his testimony, I believe, was that she sent

Devon $3.5 million to invest in commercial property in Brooklyn and then received the return on those investments. She didn't give him anything. It was not some --

Mr. Fallon. And Devon was one of your business partners, correct?

The Witness. Yes.

Mr. Fallon. Okay.

And then a few months, or a few weeks, months, after that, Yelena Baturina attended a dinner at Cafe Milano and your dad was there?

The Witness. I don't know the timing of it, but I do know that she was at a dinner, and I do believe that --

Mr. Fallon. Okay. Because I remember you -- a couple hours ago, you said that.

The Witness. -- stopped over at the dinner that was there. I think it was my birthday, and my dad stopped --

Mr. Fallon. And then Kenes, Kenes Rakishev, the fellow from Kazakhstan, wired to Devon $142,300, and then Devon happened to wire that, transfer that to you, and then you happened to buy a Porsche the very next day for $142,300?

Mr. Lowell. I think that misstates the record. Devon Archer sends money to a car dealer and not to Mr. Biden --

The Witness. Yeah.

Mr. Lowell. -- if you look at the record.

Mr. Fallon. Okay. But then you kept the car?

The Witness. Regardless, is that -- yes, I kept the car.

Mr. Fallon. Okay. And then Kenes Rakishev had dinner with your father shortly thereafter?

The Witness. I don't know whether it happened before that or after that. I

have no knowledge of that. Again, I would say to you, is that Kenes Rakishev was a guest at the dinner that I had for the presentation about the World Food Programme. My dad stopped by. I never did anything on behalf of Kenes Rakishev or asked anyone to do anything on behalf of Kenes Rakishev.

Mr. Fallon. And, then, the spring of 2014, one of the Burisma executives, Vadym Pozharsky -- who you'd already been working for now on the board. Then, after they hired you, Vadym Pozharsky had dinner with your father as well?

The Witness. He did not have dinner with my father. I said this --

Mr. Fallon. He did not have dinner with your father?

The Witness. -- many times before.

My dad did not come for dinner. He came and sat down at the presentations. He sat down next to Father Alex, who he's known for almost 42 years, who was a close family friend. And I believe that he probably had a Coca-Cola and a bowl of spaghetti, maybe, and then got up and gave Xanthi a hug and Michael a hug, walked out, shook hands to the people that were sitting on the table.

Mr. Fallon. So he ate there. Most people would define that as having dinner.

Mr. Lowell. Well, he said he's not sure that he ate.

The Witness. I'm not sure that he ate. I'm not sure he ate.

Mr. Fallon. Okay. Well, he said spaghetti. I --

Mr. Lowell. He said he might've had a bowl of spaghetti.

Mr. Fallon. So he might've had dinner. Okay.

The Witness. My bottom line is this: is that, yes, my dad attended, in one form or another, was -- he stopped by, whatever way you want to characterize it, but for nothing other than to say hello to the people around the table and particularly those related to the World Food Programme.

Mr. Fallon. Do you see the pattern here, though? I mean, people give money to either you or your business associates and then they have access to your dad?

All right, last question. Thank you for indulging me. Are you aware that your uncle --

The Witness. The pattern that I see is that you literally have no evidence whatsoever --

Mr. Fallon. Well, I'm getting to that too.

The Witness. -- of any corruption on the part of my father. And, therefore, what you're trying to do --

Mr. Fallon. There's no question.

The Witness. -- is you're trying to make every single thing in business that I was ever involved in somehow corrupt. That's what I see.

Mr. Fallon. Are you aware of a canceled check that your uncle, Jim Biden --

The Witness. No.

Mr. Fallon. -- gave to your father for $200,000?

The Witness. No.

Mr. Fallon. All right. It's out in the public.

The Witness. I have no knowledge of it.

Mr. Lowell. Do you have --

Mr. Fallon. Yeah, we have a copy of it.

Mr. Lowell. I'd like to see it.

Mr. Fallon. All right.

Mr. Lowell. I mean, if you're going to ask him about it. Or is the question, does he know about it?

The Witness. No. I have no knowledge about it. Never mind.

Mr. Lowell. Okay. If he has no knowledge about it, I don't need to see it.

The Witness. Yeah.

Mr. Fallon. All right.

There's a canceled check for $200,000 from Jim Biden to Joe Biden. It says --

Mr. Lowell. What's the date?

Mr. Fallon. March 1st, 2018. It was from Americore, wired $200,000 to Jim Biden, your uncle. That very same day, your uncle cut your father a check for $200,000, the exact same amount.

The Witness. I've seen the public reporting, and my --

Mr. Fallon. It said "loan repayment." And I believe there's another one for $40,000, same thing, "loan repayment."

So my question to you would be: If that's indeed a loan, which is what's been claimed by the administration, why wouldn't the President just produce the original loan, the check? It's a check. If I loaned my sister 200 grand and she pays me back, I would produce the $200,000 and we will all eat crow. Why do you --

The Witness. You guys --

Mr. Fallon. -- think that's never happened?

The Witness. -- have to be kidding me. He has released 27 years of his tax returns. You defend a man that won't release his tax returns and is the least transparent human being on the face of the Earth, in Mr. Trump, and you're saying that he should bow to you because of this improper process and somehow bend to you and do what no other President, let alone your President, your supposed President, would ever do? I don't --

Mr. Fallon. To produce a check?

The Witness. Look, I do not --

Mr. Fallon. To produce a canceled check?

The Witness. -- speak for my father. I do not speak for my father. I do not speak for the administration. I do not speak for his lawyers. I can only speak for myself. I have no knowledge or understanding or any view into this whatsoever. None of it. I have no idea. Whatever it was was between my uncle and my dad.

And all I know from the public reporting is my dad loaned my uncle money, and supposedly my uncle paid him back that money. That's all I know.

Mr. Jordan. We're over our hour. We'll take a little break, and then we'll let the Democrats have their hour.

[redacted]. Off the record.

[Recess.]

[redacted]. We are back on the record.

Mrs. Spartz?

Mrs. Spartz. I'll just be brief. For the timeline --

Voice. Shh.

Mr. Swalwell. For the record, can we get the order so that it's clear and there's no more --

Mr. Lowell. Yes. It's --

[redacted]. Yeah, I just said it.

Mr. Swalwell. Not on the record.

Mr. Lowell. [redacted], will you say it on the record, so we can finish this, please?

[redacted]. We're not doing it on the record.

Mrs. Spartz, go ahead.

Mr. Swalwell. No, say it on the record, because we're afraid you're not going to

stick to it.

Mrs. Spartz. No, it's okay.

[redacted]. Mrs. Spartz, go ahead, please.

Mrs. Spartz. Okay.

Just for the timeline, Mr. Biden, when was the time when you first met Mykola Zlochevsky?

The Witness. The first time that I met Mr. Zlochevsky is at the, I believe, after joining the board, the first board meeting. I can't remember when it was, but if you -- do you know the --

Mrs. Spartz. When was the time of the first board meeting?

The Witness. Do you mind if I ask?

Mrs. Spartz. Yeah.

[Discussion off the record.]

The Witness. I believe May of 2014.

Mrs. Spartz. May of 2014.

The Witness. I believe so. I believe.

Mrs. Spartz. Okay.

The Witness. I'm not positive.

Mrs. Spartz. Were you aware that Mykola Zlochevsky was, in 2010, after President Yanukovych, who is right now residing under Putin's protection in Russia, he was the natural resources minister, ecology minister in charge of overseeing energy ministry, including Burisma? Were --

The Witness. Yes.

Mrs. Spartz. -- you aware of that?

The Witness. And I also am aware that he resigned in protest from that

administration.

Mrs. Spartz. Well, he actually wasn't resigned. He had another position in that administration as security advisor. And, actually, his allegations -- a lot of corruption allegations were connected to licenses that Burisma was getting at the time when he was minister.

You ever heard of that or not? And including some of the licenses in Crimea and other areas.

The Witness. And, again, those were -- your characterization of them is not my understanding of them, but I --

Mrs. Spartz. So you don't acknowledge that he was working in the administration of President Yanukovych?

The Witness. No. What I know is that he resigned in protest, and that's what I was told, and that's what he said, that he resigned in protest in the Yanukovych administration.

Mrs. Spartz. So he -- okay.

What about when you were actually getting with this board meeting, were you aware that Burisma was under investigation in U.K. for money-laundering investigations and including some of the $23 million of assets were frozen? Were you aware of that?

The Witness. When I joined the board, I was not aware of it. And I think we went through this question before. And what I know: There were two reports done by multinational security firms. One of them was a Crowe report, and one of them was a Nardello report. Neither of those reports, at the time that I joined the board --

Mrs. Spartz. So you were not aware of this investigation? And regardless --

The Witness. Not when I joined the board. Based upon --

Mrs. Spartz. But later on you will become aware of this?

The Witness. Well, then it became public.

Mrs. Spartz. Did you take any actions? Did you talk about that with anyone in the United States, with your father, or any one of those related to that situation?

The Witness. No, no discussions with anybody in the United States or anybody in -- officials whatsoever about that.

Mrs. Spartz. Okay. Did you meet with President Poroshenko or any of the prosecutors? Have you met with them on these issues in Ukraine?

The Witness. I've never traveled to Ukraine. I've never met with any --

Mrs. Spartz. Okay.

The Witness. -- Ukrainian officials.

Mrs. Spartz. What about Yuriy Evenushin (ph), Konstantin Korchemko (ph), or Andriy Kicha? Have you ever --

The Witness. No.

Mrs. Spartz. None of this name?

So were you aware that Prosecutor Shokin opened investigation of Burisma in 2015? Were you aware of that?

The Witness. I'm aware that -- that Prosecutor Shokin -- no, I'm not aware that he opened --

Mrs. Spartz. You're not aware of that?

The Witness. No.

Mrs. Spartz. And were you aware that, when all of those investigations were abruptly closed -- at least one of them was settled through tax evasion in 2016, but a lot of them, it was an enormous amount of investigations, were closed -- the director of Anti-Corruption Action Center said, the proceedings led by the Prosecutor General's Office were not just shut, they were intentionally botched.

Were you aware of that anti-corruption agency in Ukraine was shocked on closing all of this investigation?

The Witness. Again, I'm not aware of your characterization of that, and I know that I have a very different characterization of that, but yes.

Mrs. Spartz. So you still believe that, you know, Mykola Zlochevsky is fighting for freedoms against Putin and is really a high-integrity person, from your understanding?

The Witness. No. That's your --

Mrs. Spartz. You said it was your word that you said.

The Witness. That's your characterization of it.

Mrs. Spartz. No, that's what your characterization was earlier. I just tried to clarify.

Mr. Lowell. I'm sorry, Congresswoman --

Mrs. Spartz. So what is your characterization?

Mr. Lowell. -- that's not his characterization.

The Witness. It's okay. It's okay. I understand. Yes?

Mrs. Spartz. So what is your characterization, then, of Mykola Zlochevsky?

The Witness. I don't -- at this point, after 6 hours here, my characterization was made clear in the 3,000 other answers that I gave. I can't speak to it.

And I would never, ever challenge -- and I mean this sincerely -- your deep knowledge of what has happened in Ukraine, what is happening in Ukraine, and the struggle that Ukraine is having right now against Vladimir Putin. And I appreciate the way that you speak about it on other things, so I appreciate your opinion about that.

That was not my characterization.

Mrs. Spartz. [Inaudible.] What do you think was the main function you were hired by Mykola Zlochevsky to do, really?

The Witness. I think I've answered that question a number of times.

Mrs. Spartz. Was it to help with Ukraine? Do you have a deep understanding of Ukraine? What was the main reason you believe he hired you?

The Witness. Oh, I think that I have a deep understanding of Ukraine as many people in this room. I studied the region my entire life.

Mrs. Spartz. But you don't even understand all of this corruption investigation --

The Witness. That's your characterization --

Mrs. Spartz. -- so maybe it's not as deep.

The Witness. Congresswoman, I don't --

Mrs. Spartz. Sorry. Okay.

The Witness. These are statements that you're making. I disagree with your statements. But I want you to --

Mrs. Spartz. Well, these are statements of fact.

The Witness. -- to know that I respect your --

Mrs. Spartz. Maybe we'll have interaction on more facts next time. Thank you, though.

[redacted]. Mr. Gaetz?

Mrs. Spartz. Thank you for being here.

The Witness. Maybe we can work on the same time next -- same side.

Mrs. Spartz. Thank you.

The Witness. I appreciate it.

[redacted]. Mr. Gaetz?

The Witness. Thank you.

Mr. Gaetz. Mr. Biden, have you ever received a payment from Russia or any Russian business entities?

The Witness. No.

Mr. Gaetz. No Russian business entities?

The Witness. No, not that I know of.

Mr. Gaetz. Okay. Great.

I think we're on exhibit 26 now?

The Reporter. Twenty-six.

[Biden Exhibit No. 26
was marked for identification.]

Mr. Gaetz. Let me know when you've had a chance to review that, Mr. Biden.

The Witness. Yes.

Mr. Gaetz. So does this purport -- do you recall receiving this email?

The Witness. No, I do not. Is it an email or a -- oh, okay. Email? Yeah.

Mr. Gaetz. That is your email address, right, hbiden@rosemontseneca,com?

The Witness. That was an email address, yes.

Mr. Gaetz. Okay. And it was your email address at the time of 2015?

The Witness. I believe so.

Mr. Gaetz. Okay. And so does this time period match the time period in where there was this meeting at Cafe Milano between your father and Mr. Pozharsky?

The Witness. Mr. Gaetz, at this hour, I don't remember exactly when it was, but if you tell me that this matches that time, I will trust that you're being accurate.

Mr. Gaetz. And the email reads, "Dear Hunter, thank you for inviting me to DC and giving [me] an opportunity to meet your father and [spend] some time together."

The Witness. Yep.

Mr. Gaetz. "[It was a real] honor and pleasure."

So the email goes on to request a coffee meeting with you. Did that coffee

meeting occur?

The Witness. If Vadym was in D.C., he was in D.C. on Burisma business or for other reasons, and of course I would've met with him. He was the secretary to the board and basically the translator.

Mr. Gaetz. I'm just asking if you recall this particular coffee --

The Witness. No. Again --

Mr. Gaetz. -- meeting that's referenced.

The Witness. -- this is over almost 10 years ago. I don't specifically remember that coffee. But I have no reason to suspect that this isn't accurate.

Mr. Gaetz. And since Vadym is literally writing you about meeting with your father -- and, at this time, they were paying you a million bucks a year, right?

The Witness. I don't know, again, the timing of this, but I think that -- again, I've gone over this and over this and over this.

What Vadym is talking about is that, the night before, he attended the World Food Programme dinner at Cafe Milano. My dad came to that and stopped by to say hello to people that were there that he had a longstanding relationship with. Vadym was one of the people sitting at the table, and he said hello to them.

They did not have a meeting; they met, which is a very, very important distinction with a difference.

Mr. Gaetz. Please tell me the difference between meeting and having a meeting.

The Witness. Okay. So, out in the hall, when I went to the room, I shook hands with one of the Capitol Hill Police. I met that Capitol Hill Police officer. The next day, there may be someone who'll say, "It was nice to meet you." It does not mean that we had a meeting.

Do you understand that now?

Mr. Gaetz. I understand that --

The Witness. And that's what I'm talking about.

Mr. Gaetz. -- that's your appreciation for it. And so --

The Witness. That's not my appreciation for it. It's the exact definition of what it would mean to say that I met someone. I've met many people in this room, but we haven't had a meeting.

Mr. Gaetz. Yeah. And so, coffee or no coffee, do you recall --

The Witness. With Vadym? I'm sure that I probably had coffee with Vadym. Afterwards, I probably saw Vadym more than one time when he was there.

Mr. Gaetz. Okay. And what did you discuss?

The Witness. I have no idea. It was 9 years ago. At a particular meeting, at a coffee? I have no clue. But what I'm sure --

Mr. Gaetz. You don't think that this email talking about your dad from someone paying --

The Witness. I just told you exactly what it is.

Mr. Gaetz. Excuse me, Mr. Biden. I'm asking the question.

The Witness. I thought you were making a statement again. I just was --

Mr. Gaetz. No.

The Witness. -- going to answer it.

Mr. Gaetz. No. My question is, like, do you believe that this writing which references meeting your father, the word m-e-e-t --

The Witness. No, it doesn't say a meeting with my father, Mr. Gaetz.

Mr. Gaetz. Okay. Opportunity to meet your father.

The Witness. It says meet with my father. I just explained to you the difference between meeting someone and having a meeting with someone.

Mr. Gaetz. But does this --

The Witness. What don't you understand?

Mr. Gaetz. I guess I don't understand, and maybe you could help clarify, how you can maintain that your father had nothing to do with your business ventures when your business associate is talking about an interaction with your father and then wanting to have coffee with you subsequently to discuss it.

The Witness. If my father was to sit down here today and he was to call me right now and I was in and I put him on the speakerphone, does that mean that he had a meeting with you, Mr. Gaetz? Does that --

Mr. Gaetz. Yeah.

The Witness. -- mean he discussed business with you? Do you believe that?

Mr. Gaetz. It depends on what's discussed.

The Witness. If he came in this room --

Mr. Gaetz. Okay, Mr. Biden --

The Witness. -- and shook everybody's hand, as he would, because, as you know -- and you guys have to do it yourselves. You walk these halls, you go to events, you go to dinners, you go to dinners for, you know, from everything under the sun, you sit at a table, you are at a table with 14 other people; "It was nice to meet you," "It was nice to meet you." Does it mean that you had a meeting?

Mr. Gaetz. It seems as though --

The Witness. If everybody that you've even been to dinner with --

Mr. Gaetz. -- you had a bribe --

The Witness. Excuse me?

Mr. Gaetz. -- if not a meeting. Is this -- does this consummate your bribe?

The Witness. Mr. Gaetz, do you have evidence of a bribe that --

Mr. Lowell. I'm sorry. Could you --

Mr. Gaetz. Does this writing consummate a bribe, Mr. Biden?

The Witness. I would love to see the evidence of that.

Mr. Gaetz. Okay. Let's --

The Witness. Show me the evidence of that.

Mr. Gaetz. Well, it --

The Witness. I think the only person --

Mr. Gaetz. I'll move on.

The Witness. -- that you believe that has evidence of that is a guy named Alexander Smirnov, who's in lockup in L.A. right now, being charged and indicted for lying on behalf of Russian intelligence.

Mr. Gaetz. Well --

The Witness. That's the only person that I know that has supposed evidence of a bribe other than Mr. Gal Luft.

Mrs. Greene. While your father is President.

The Witness. Excuse me?

Mr. Gaetz. Hold on.

The Witness. Come forward, Ms. Greene.

Mrs. Greene. While your father is President.

The Witness. Okay.

Mrs. Greene. That's pretty interesting.

The Witness. Anyway. I apologize. It's the end of the day.

Mr. Gaetz. Maybe.

The Witness. I think that there's a distinction between meeting someone, shaking their hand, saying hello, and having a meeting with someone. I think that, in my

world --

Mr. Gaetz. But when the someone is paying you a million bucks to facilitate their goals --

The Witness. Okay.

Mr. Gaetz. -- it seems as though you are eager to involve your father. Is that not what that email seems to demonstrate?

The Witness. No, I categorically disagree with your characterizations of that.

Mr. Gaetz. Okay. I'll move on.

We're going to go to exhibit 26 -- I'm sorry, 27.

[Biden Exhibit No. 27
was marked for identification.]

Mr. Gaetz. Let me know when you've had a chance to review it, Mr. Biden.

The Witness. I've seen -- I've reviewed it.

Mr. Gaetz. Okay. And do you -- what is this email?

The Witness. It looks like an email from Eric Schwerin. I have not seen this email before, but it says -- the pages are blanked out. It's June 10th, 2010.

It says, "Your Dad's Delaware tax refund check came today. I am depositing it in his account and writing a check in that amount back to you since he owes it to you. Don't think I need to run it by him, but if you want to go ahead. If not, I will deposit tomorrow."

Mr. Gaetz. Okay.

The Witness. Yeah.

Mr. Gaetz. So why did your dad owe you his refund check?

The Witness. I think that Mr. Schwerin testified to this at length over a period of, I don't know, 4, 5, 6 hours, in which he handled the, basically, bills for my dad for things.

And, in this instance, I think that Mr. Schwerin wasn't able to get in contact with my dad over, I think, literally the -- whether it was to pay the people that take the garbage from the House in Delaware or whether it was for the pool service, and they had a back-due. He couldn't get in touch with my dad. They were going to end the service or something, and so he asked me if I would just pay it.

I paid it. And then my dad's Delaware tax refund check came in for $1,640, and Eric said, I'll just send that to you in repayment because you paid the pool service guy.

Mr. Gaetz. Was it --

The Witness. Maybe the pool. I'm generalizing, but, yeah, something like that.

Mr. Gaetz. So, since you're just using pool service as an example, is it safe to say that, in this instance, you're being paid back for having fronted some sort of costs for --

The Witness. I didn't say that, Mr. Gaetz.

Mr. Gaetz. Well, no, I'm trying to understand it.

The Witness. But I don't know. I don't know the exact details of it, but I know that it was something as completely innocuous and -- I mean, what are you saying?

Number one, it's 2010. I have no involvement with anyone that you're talking about here that has any relationship with --

Mr. Gaetz. You have no involvement with Mr. Schwerin?

The Witness. I am involved with Mr. Schwerin. I'm saying --

Mr. Gaetz. Okay.

The Witness. -- of any of the other questions I've received today about any of the foreign business --

Mr. Gaetz. But I'm asking you this question, Mr. Biden. Just let's focus on this question.

The Witness. Okay.

Mr. Gaetz. What --

The Witness. I just answered the question.

Mr. Gaetz. Okay. So --

The Witness. I answered the question to the best of my ability. I have nothing else to say on it.

Mr. Gaetz. And so how often did you pay for your father's --

The Witness. I have no idea.

Mr. Gaetz. -- pool service or other types of expenses?

The Witness. I believe far, far, far and few between, and just like a normal son would take care of something for their dad or their dad would take care of something for their son. I mean, literally, it is --

Mr. Gaetz. Yeah, I think there's a whole lot of the dad taking care of --

The Witness. Well, listen, Mr. Gaetz --

Mr. Gaetz. -- stuff for his son.

The Witness. -- if you do --

Mr. Gaetz. But I'm asking about this tax return.

The Witness. -- if you do, then point to me in other places where you see that I am somehow paying my dad. But I am telling you --

Mr. Gaetz. I'm just wondering why he owes you money.

The Witness. What?

Mr. Gaetz. I'm wondering why Mr. Schwerin thought your dad owed you money and --

The Witness. Have you ever gone out to dinner with your dad and paid?

Mr. Gaetz. This is not about me and my dad.

The Witness. I'm asking you, have you ever been out to dinner with your dad

and paid?

Mr. Gaetz. Me and my dad aren't involved in international bribes, Mr. Biden.

The Witness. It's a normal question.

Mr. Swalwell. Hey, hey, hey. Come on.

The Witness. Well, I am not involved in international bribes. That literally is slander.

Mr. Swalwell. Just ask the question.

Mr. Gaetz. I am asking the question.

The Witness. We've already determined that.

Mr. Swalwell. You're making statements.

Mr. Lowell. I would like everybody to stop and let a question be asked and an answer be given, and that includes you, Congressman Gaetz. Please, let him answer a question.

And if you're going to make a speech or make an allegation of bribery, you can do that, you can do it on the floor, you can do it today, but it's not really a question, and you know the point.

So why don't you keep going.

Mr. Gaetz. Happy to.

How many times did you pay for your father's household expenses?

The Witness. I don't know. I can't answer that.

Mr. Gaetz. More or less than 10?

The Witness. I can't answer that here.

Mr. Gaetz. More or less than 20?

The Witness. I am under oath, and I'm not going to answer with any specificity or generality whatsoever. I do not know.

Mr. Gaetz. More or less than 50?

The Witness. Again, Mr. Gaetz, I cannot answer with any specificity --

Mr. Lowell. Why don't you go to 100 or 200 or 500, because the answer will be the same.

The Witness. I do not know. Yeah.

Mr. Gaetz. Okay.

More or less than 500 times have you paid expenses for your dad?

Mr. Lowell. Go to 1,000. He just said he doesn't know. Take any number you want.

Mr. Gaetz. I did. I picked 500.

Mr. Lowell. Okay.

Mr. Gaetz. Can I get an answer?

The Witness. I think I already answered it. I'm not --

Mr. Gaetz. No, you didn't answer as to 500.

The Witness. Five million. I don't have any recollection, no matter how large you make the number or how small you make the number. I don't have, with any specificity, without any documentation in front of me, to be able to quantify how many times over the course of my 54 years of life and my adulthood in which I paid an incidental bill or dinner for my dad or, you know, the ski rentals when we went skiing together. I don't know.

Mr. Gaetz. So it sounds like your finances were pretty interwoven.

Mr. Lowell. Will the record show that we're all laughing?

The Witness. I mean, are you kidding me? No. I don't -- again --

Mr. Gaetz. So do you --

The Witness. I'm sorry, Mr. Gaetz, I'll take you seriously. And it's hard to do --

Mr. Lowell. Why would you do that?

The Witness. -- but I will. I will take you seriously, but it's hard to do.

I disagree with your characterization of what you just said. No, our finances aren't interwoven. What are interwoven is that we're a family. And I don't think that it is any different than any other family in which you have adult children, you have grandchildren that are adult children, and that, you know, sometimes I pay for dinner, when I was earning enough money to be able to do it, but most of the time my dad would pay for dinner, if he could pay for dinner, if he didn't forget his credit card, which 90 percent of the time he usually does.

Mr. Gaetz. Mr. Biden, I have not asked you any questions about dinner. I'm asking questions about household expenses, which you say --

The Witness. I answered the question.

Mr. Gaetz. -- are the basis for this.

The Witness. No, I said -- I answered the question. There was never a time in which I paid for something that my dad did not pay me back. There was never a time in which I gave my dad money --

Mr. Gaetz. Did you keep receipts?

The Witness. You have all my receipts. You have every bank account that I've ever had. You have every bank record that I've ever had. You've subpoenaed, I have not objected to your subpoena, over 10,000 pages, 14,000 pages of bank records. You have every transaction that I've ever made.

Do you see a transaction, Mr. Gaetz? It's not incumbent upon me to point to you to something that doesn't exist. It's incumbent upon you to create something, to come up with something based upon the voluminous evidence that you've collected, which shows no involvement.

[4:09 p.m.]

Mr. Gaetz. Well, the email that we're discussing from Mr. Schwerin seems to reflect your involvement in your father's personal finances. Are you disputing that?

The Witness. Yes, I am disputing that.

Mr. Lowell. What do you mean by "involvement"? What's the term you mean, paying back his father for --

Mr. Gaetz. Mr. Lowell --

The Witness. Okay. I can answer. Is it -- I disagree with the way that you characterize that, wholeheartedly, completely. I just state for the record one more time, under oath and under penalty of perjury, my father has never been involved in my business. I have never asked my father to be involved in my business. My father has never benefited from my business, and I have never asked anyone -- or my father -- to do anything for the benefit of anyone I've ever done business for.

Mr. Gaetz. If you're paying your father's household expenses, how would he not be benefiting from your --

The Witness. I did not -- I did not pay my father's household expenses, and you're taking one email completely out of context in 2010, over 14 years ago, that was related to an incidental bill in which my father paid me back because -- because, according to Eric, not even to me, that somehow he owed it to me.

Mr. Gaetz. Doesn't even look like Eric informed your father.

The Witness. So he paid me back -- so if -- under this, if you just take this for what it is, and he paid me back, can you tell me exactly what is wrong with that?

Mr. Gaetz. I'm just asking questions.

The Witness. No. What's wrong with it? You're not just asking questions.

You're making an implication. You said things like "bribery" in this -- in this conversation about this email.

Mr. Lowell. Wait. He bribed about a pool service?

The Witness. Yeah. If my dad -- if I -- if the pool guy was there and he said, "Hey, I need payment before I go do this," and I said, "Here," and I paid him, and my dad, 2 days later, came and said, "Hey, thanks for getting the pool guy; it would've gone green if you hadn't done that; here's the money that you just paid," you think that that's bribery --

Mr. Gaetz. But that's not what happened, Mr. Biden.

The Witness. -- over this $800?

Mr. Gaetz. That's not what's happening. What's happening here is, you're fronting expenses for your dad, and Schwerin --

The Witness. I am not fronting expenses. You keep making things up, Mr. Gaetz.

Mr. Gaetz. That was -- that was your testimony.

It's fine. We can go to -- we can go to the next one.

The Witness. I don't want to get in an argument with you, but it is absolutely ludicrous. It literally makes no sense.

Mr. Gaetz. We'll go to -- we'll go to exhibit 28.

[Biden Exhibit No. 28
was marked for identification.]

The Witness. It truly does not have any bearing, resemblance to reality. I sometimes don't understand, what are you talking about?

Mr. Gaetz. Well, if you're paying things that you're then getting Schwerin --

The Witness. Getting repaid for?

Mr. Gaetz. Yeah, I'm trying to ascertain the dollar amount.

The Witness. If I'm paying for an incidental bill for my father and he's repaying me for it, there's somehow bribery?

Mr. Gaetz. But you don't know what you paid for, why he's paying you back.

The Witness. -- Mr. Gaetz, it's because you do. I don't have -- you have --

Mr. Gaetz. Okay. Let's go to our next -- let's go to 28.

The Witness. -- 10 years of my bank records. Go through it.

Mr. Gaetz. Let me know when --

The Witness. You have gone through it, and you haven't found anything, and that's why you can't point to anything except out-of-context, 14-year-old text messages.

Mr. Gaetz. Actually, Mr. Biden, we found, like, all this Ukrainian, Russian, and Chinese money that you seem to make. Let me just ask you the question this way.

While your dad was Vice President, how much money from foreign --

Mr. Lowell. Hold on before you ask a question because it has nothing to do with your question.

[Discussion off the record.]

The Witness. Okay. Okay. Yes.

Mr. Gaetz. Are you ready?

The Witness. Yes.

Mr. Gaetz. Okay. Great.

So, while your dad was Vice President, how much foreign money did you make?

The Witness. I don't know the exact money, and, again, what I would like to say --

Mr. Gaetz. Well, was it in the millions?

Mr. Lowell. Are you going to let him answer the question, or are you going to do

your soap box?

The Witness. It's the same thing. It's the same thing. Okay? I'll give you the same answer that I had. I had business relationships. I had business relationships with individuals that were foreign nationals from several different places. I was paid for the legitimate business that I conducted with those people, and so I don't know the exact number, but, again --

Mr. Gaetz. Was it in the millions?

The Witness. -- again, you have all of my bank accounts. I did very well during a period of my life, absolutely. I don't know the exact figure, but it's not a figure that you continue to keep throwing around. But --

Mr. Gaetz. I'm just asking.

The Witness. -- you have that number.

Mr. Gaetz. Okay.

The Witness. I find it to be highly disingenuous because you have my bank account; you have my tax returns. Unlike every other American, somehow you guys were able to get my tax returns. I'm a private citizen. I don't think you have Jared Kushner's tax returns, do you? But you have mine, and it has nothing to do with anything that the IRS or anybody else is doing. It's because somehow I'm --

Mr. Gaetz. You're being prosecuted for violating tax laws.

The Witness. It doesn't make them --

Mr. Gaetz. No one else is being -- no one else here is throwing accusations that's being prosecuted for violating tax laws. That's you, Mr. Biden. Let me know when you've had a chance to review this exhibit.

The Witness. Want to talk about prosecutions?

Mr. Gaetz. Gladly.

The Witness. Okay. Let's move on to whatever you want to ask me. Okay?

Mr. Gaetz. Yeah. Just let me know when you've had a chance to review the exhibit.

Mr. Lowell. And, again, where is this from? We've never seen it before. Doesn't look like a complete back-and-forth.

The Witness. [redacted] --

[redacted]. Yes, sir.

The Witness. -- we did have a deal. We did have a deal that there would be -- that you would provide them -- just I want to make it clear, okay, just for the record. I want to the record to make it clear that you made a deal with us -- you personally -- that no documents that were not presented to us beforehand would be used. And don't tell me that if they came in through Mr. Gaetz or somebody else --

[redacted]. Well --

The Witness. -- I'm just saying in terms of -- in terms of --

[redacted]. What the understanding was, that --

The Witness. I don't want to argue about it, but okay --

[redacted]. Well, we're certainly not arguing.

The Witness. -- so let's leave it alone.

Mr. Swalwell. Just tell us where it's from. That's all he's saying.

[redacted]. I didn't -- I didn't --

Mr. Swalwell. Okay. Just tell us where it's from, we'll move on.

Mr. Lowell. Yeah.

Mr. Gaetz. I'm just asking -- I'm asking --

Voice. Where does this come from?

Mr. Swalwell. Where did you get it though?

Mr. Gaetz. Well, I'm going to lay foundation and ask the witness to -- if he recalls sending it or receiving it.

Mr. Lowell. If you lay the foundation, let's just move on. Go ahead.

Mr. Gaetz. Yeah.

Do you recall receiving this email -- these messages?

The Witness. I do not recall because I don't know whether this email -- I don't have any verification. It's a printout of something, and so I don't know.

But I do know this, is that -- well, ask me the question that you wanted to ask me about it.

Mr. Gaetz. Yeah. So the email reads, "You, me, we have to deal with this now, exclamation point, exclamation point, exclamation point, exclamation point, exclamation point. I'm not kidding. They, Joe, have the Buccinis being called by your landlord. It get much more outrageous. You have to let me in to help. I'm with you a hundred percent."

Does that ring a bell?

Mr. Lowell. Is this purporting to be --

The Witness. I can answer the question.

Mr. Lowell. No, Mr. -- it says "James Biden" on top. Did you ask Mr. James Biden about this?

Mr. Raskin. When he was here?

Mr. Lowell. Yeah.

Mr. Raskin. That's the funny -- I don't remember this coming up.

Mr. Lowell. And it says it's James Biden, so I just don't know --

Mr. Gaetz. I'm not -- listen, Mr. Lowell, we're not --

The Witness. Okay. Well, anyway, I don't know -- let's lay the predicate for it.

What you put in front of me is something that simply says "James Biden," and it says, "Archives, all email, October 1st, 2017." And then it purports to be a message, I don't know who because there's no to and from line, and it just says "James Biden."

And, if you're asking me if he's calling me, I know exactly what my uncle is talking about.

Mr. Gaetz. What is he talking about?

The Witness. He is -- he is greatly concerned about my -- me and my addiction. He's trying to get me help.

Mr. Gaetz. Does this have anything to do with business?

The Witness. No, it has completely to do with the fact that he's really worried about me, he's worried about me as my uncle, and he's saying that other people are worried about me. He's saying that -- the Buccinis are old friends. They're -- you know, they're getting calls from people about your behavior, and so forth and so on.

Again, if your intention was to embarrass me, Mr. Gaetz, you have once again succeeded.

Mr. Gaetz. What is the "O" reference?

The Witness. I don't know if there's a typo or anything --

Mr. Gaetz. Okay.

The Witness. -- if he's meeting -- I have no idea. I don't know who the "he" is, "the O," I don't know.

Mr. Gaetz. I'm just wondering if in your correspondence with your uncle, like, the "O" meant something, like if it was a nickname or a place that you're familiar with?

The Witness. No. I think if you look at this particular email, there's about 13 other typos in there, including spacing, including other things, and I don't know who he's talking about, and I certainly don't know now.

Mr. Gaetz. But -- but you're certain that it's personal related, not business?

The Witness. I'm not certain of anything about this email.

Mr. Gaetz. Okay.

The Witness. As I said to you before, it's not even an email. It's not even in any form that I recognize as being a form of communication other than you put it in front of me, Mr. Gaetz.

Mr. Gaetz. Do you recall on October 1st, 2017, what kind of shape you were in?

Mr. Lowell. On that particular day?

The Witness. No, I don't recall, but it -- again, I don't know the accuracy of this, but I know that that's what my uncle is talking about if this, in fact, is my uncle.

Mr. Gaetz. Those are all my questions.

Mr. Lowell. Thank you.

[Recess.]

Mr. Lowell. Are we on the record?

[redacted]. Yeah.

BY [redacted]:

Q Mr. Biden, I just have a few very quick points. You were talking about the voluminous bank records --

A Yes.

Q -- in the committee's possession. The committee has in its possession over a 100,000 pages of records relating to this investigation.

A I was off by a factor of 10. Sorry.

Q You were asked about a check that your uncle wrote to your father marked "loan repayment" for $200,000.

A Yes.

Q Do you -- do you recall being asked about that?

A In this --

Q Yeah, in the previous hour.

A Oh, yes. Yes.

Q And I just -- there was a comment made that the committee did not have in its possession the money going from your father to your uncle, and I just want to make clear for the record that bank records received by the committee from PNC Bank on October 17th, 2023, Bates No. PNC 00001219, show that, 6 weeks prior to that check, on January 12th, 2018, a wire from the client trust account at the Monzack Law Firm, of which Joe Biden is a client, wired $200,000 to the joint account of Jim and Sara Biden.

And, as Jim Biden testified in his transcribed interview, that was the wire of his brother loaning him the $200,000 that he later repaid by check.

And, similarly, the $40,000 loan, that same document, PNC 1219, shows the wire from the Mel Monzack Firm to the joint account of Jim and Sara Biden.

A Thank you.

BY [redacted]:

Q Mr. Biden, exhibit, I think it was No. 27, the Eric Schwerin email that you were asked about at length, Mr. Schwerin -- you're aware that Mr. Schwerin testified before this committee?

A Yes, I am.

Q And he testified that this was actually -- he was asked about this email.

A Okay.

Q He testified that it was, actually, your father was paying you back for a joint cell phone plan. Does that sound familiar?

A That very well could be.

Q Okay.

A That was the incidental bill, yes.

Q And you have no reason to dispute Mr. Schwerin's explanation that this is --

A No, I have no reason to dispute, no.

Q -- there was a family plan, and your father had a line that he paid you for?

A Okay, yeah. Yes.

Q In one of the earlier hours, there was an insinuation made that, because you had created a number of LLCs or because you were involved in a number of LLCs, that that was some kind of an effort to obfuscate your business dealings or to do something nefarious. Are you familiar with the purpose of an LLC?

A Yes, I am.

Q What's your understanding?

A My understanding of the purpose of LLC is to protect an individual through the law and precedent, particularly in the State of Delaware, so that you don't have personal liability. The liability lies with the -- with the corporate entity, and so it's a form of protection for individuals conducting business.

And so every time that you open up a business, you're most often recommended to create an LLC so that you do not have personal liability -- or direct personal liability.

Q And, when you created LLCs, it was never your intent to conceal your business dealings, correct?

A No, the exact opposite actually, is that the LLCs were publicly registered, and it's -- some LLCs have public-facing names, like Rosemont Seneca Partners. Others have -- are, you know, they operate -- the operating entity in which you -- income and other things flow through and in and out of in order to be able to do it in a cogent way.

[redacted]. Thank you.

The Witness. Yeah.

Mr. Raskin. Mr. Swalwell? No questions.

Mr. Biden, I just wanted to go back to that last email that was sprung on us in the last round of questioning. I don't know if it's an email, a text, a letter message purportedly from James Biden.

It's not something that Mr. Biden, your uncle, brought to us when he testified here. It's not anything that he was presented to. I don't remember ever seeing this before, and I just -- I couldn't hear all of your answers.

You're not vouching for the veracity of this --

The Witness. No.

Mr. Raskin. -- document, are you?

The Witness. Not in any way, no.

Mr. Raskin. Okay. I mean, it's -- there's about 27 exclamation marks in there. I haven't seen that particular affectation connected to you.

The Witness. Yeah.

Mr. Raskin. It looks more like a Donald Trump message to me with all the exclamation marks, but -- okay. And so -- all right. In other words, you're not authenticating or validating this in any way.

The Witness. No. No.

Mr. Raskin. Okay. Does anybody have any further questions?

All right. We thank you for your patience today.

The Witness. Thank you, everybody.

[redacted]. Off the record.

[Whereupon, at 4:23 p.m., the deposition 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