

1 and he gave me his card, I obviously then looked at him  
 2 in particular on the website.  
 3 Q. So you're saying you looked at him on the website twice?  
 4 A. I looked -- initially, when I found out Perkins Coie  
 5 were the client, I obviously looked at the website, and  
 6 then I subsequently revisited their website after that  
 7 several times, and in particular after I met Mr Elias  
 8 I looked again at his entry.  
 9 Q. So you say in your witness statement, at paragraph 16  
 10 (C/4/4), that you satisfied yourself as to the  
 11 trustworthiness of both Fusion and Perkins Coie. Now,  
 12 you had worked with Fusion for some years by this stage?  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 Q. So presumably you trusted them?  
 15 A. Correct.  
 16 Q. How did you satisfy yourself of the trustworthiness of  
 17 Perkins Coie, Mr Steele?  
 18 A. Through Fusion and the fact that Fusion had previously  
 19 worked with Perkins Coie.  
 20 Q. So you thought that was -- is that how you would work  
 21 out whether someone is trustworthy or not?  
 22 A. I also asked -- sorry, the answer is yes, but I also  
 23 answered -- sorry, I also asked a couple of my legal  
 24 clients in the UK who were aware of Perkins Coie as to  
 25 whether they were a decent, respectable law firm.

161

1 Q. You don't mention that in your witness statement.  
 2 A. Not everything is in my -- I don't, no, but not  
 3 everything is in the witness statement.  
 4 Q. You say in that paragraph, 16, that you didn't ask  
 5 Fusion about the identity of its ultimate client.  
 6 A. Mm hmm.  
 7 Q. And I think -- is it your evidence you never asked about  
 8 the identity of the ultimate client?  
 9 A. I was told at one point who the ultimate client was,  
 10 later on. I don't think I pressed them with a question.  
 11 Q. I mean, in fact, we know that you knew the identity of  
 12 the ultimate client by early July 2016, don't we?  
 13 A. I was not aware of the ultimate client in the sense that  
 14 the DNC, I believe, was the ultimate client. I presumed  
 15 it was the Clinton campaign, and Glenn Simpson had  
 16 indicated that, but I was not aware of the technicality  
 17 of it being the DNC that was actually the client of  
 18 Perkins Coie.  
 19 Q. So, just tell me, in early July, who were you -- who did  
 20 you think the ultimate client was?  
 21 A. I thought it was the campaign, but I didn't know  
 22 technically who it was.  
 23 Q. You knew it was the leadership of the Clinton  
 24 presidential campaign, didn't you?  
 25 A. I believed it was the campaign, yes.

162

1 Q. The leadership of the Clinton campaign?  
 2 A. Fine, the leadership of the campaign.  
 3 Q. And you also understood that Hillary Clinton herself was  
 4 aware of what you were doing?  
 5 A. I think Glenn had mentioned it, but I wasn't clear.  
 6 Q. You see, you know what I'm referring to, Mr Steele,  
 7 don't you? Your own note of your meeting --  
 8 A. Yes.  
 9 Q. -- at [D/55.1/1].  
 10 A. With the FBI, yeah. Yes.  
 11 Q. Where you say, you record, yourself -- I mean, it's your  
 12 note so we assume it is accurate.  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 Q. In paragraph 3:  
 15 "... we explained that Glenn Simpson, GPSFusion was  
 16 our commissioner but the ultimate client were the  
 17 leadership of the Clinton presidential campaign and that  
 18 we understood the candidate herself was aware of the  
 19 reporting at least, if not us ..."  
 20 A. Yeah.  
 21 Q. So a political campaign had commissioned research into  
 22 its opponent. You had no idea as to whether or not that  
 23 was going to be used for political campaigning purposes,  
 24 legal purposes or some other purpose, did you?  
 25 A. I wasn't certain, although there were no indications

163

1 that it was going to be used for campaigning purposes.  
 2 Q. And there were no indications it was going to be used  
 3 for legal purposes either, were there, Mr Steele?  
 4 A. At that stage, given that I didn't know who the  
 5 Perkins Coie firm were, no; but, later, when I met them,  
 6 it became clear to me that our reporting wasn't,  
 7 your Lordship, being used in the campaign itself.  
 8 Q. How did that become clear?  
 9 A. Because they never deployed any of it in the campaign.  
 10 Q. No, they went -- they hawked it round every journalist  
 11 in Washington, Mr Steele, didn't they?  
 12 A. Perkins Coie?  
 13 Q. No, Fusion, at Perkins Coie's request, gave your  
 14 material to a whole host of journalists, didn't they?  
 15 A. Could you -- when you say gave my material, could you  
 16 expand on that?  
 17 Q. Well, you attended -- when you went to Washington on  
 18 21 September, there was a whole range of meetings  
 19 arranged by Mr Simpson with you and journalists, wasn't  
 20 there?  
 21 A. Yes, there was.  
 22 Q. And you gave presentations -- you didn't -- I'm not  
 23 suggesting you gave physical copies of your memorandum,  
 24 but you gave presentations to the journalists about your  
 25 findings in your reports, didn't you?

164

1 A. I discussed the issues that were in the reports with  
 2 a select group of journalists off the record; that's  
 3 correct.  
 4 Q. Mr Steele, if you want to bandy words, you gave  
 5 presentations, but the point of this was to tell  
 6 journalists what you had found about candidate Trump and  
 7 his doings in Russia, wasn't it?  
 8 A. It was to discuss the issues that came out of the  
 9 reporting. It wasn't to share the reporting with  
 10 journalists.  
 11 Q. You think that that's a legal -- that's for the purpose  
 12 of legal proceedings, do you? Is that your evidence?  
 13 A. I don't know the answer to that.  
 14 Q. Well, the answer is obvious, isn't it, Mr Steele? That  
 15 was for the purpose of political campaigning. It was to  
 16 try and get this stuff into the public domain to the  
 17 detriment of candidate Trump, wasn't it?  
 18 A. It was to try and get the journalist to investigate the  
 19 issues, is how I would put it, your Lordship.  
 20 Q. It wasn't intended to benefit candidate Trump, was it?  
 21 It wasn't intended to reflect well on him?  
 22 A. No.  
 23 Q. It was intended to reflect badly on him, wasn't it?  
 24 A. It depends whether it is true or not, whether the  
 25 material was correct, whether it was accurate.

165

1 Q. Well, I assume you believed it was accurate?  
 2 A. Yes, I did.  
 3 Q. So if you believed it was accurate, and you were  
 4 presenting it to journalists, you were doing that for  
 5 the purpose of damaging candidate Trump, weren't you?  
 6 A. I don't agree with that. I think, your Lordship, that  
 7 is too simplistic. I was airing the issues which had  
 8 arisen out of our work.  
 9 Q. Mr Steele, let me make it clear: I'm not suggesting you  
 10 were antipathetic to towards candidate Trump. You  
 11 understand me. I'm not even suggesting that in doing  
 12 this work you were trying to -- I'm not suggesting you  
 13 were trying to promote some kind of anti-Trump agenda.  
 14 What I am suggesting is that you knew that this material  
 15 was being used for political purposes, namely to advance  
 16 the interests of the Clinton campaign.  
 17 A. That may have been one of the purposes, and only in the  
 18 event that the information, the leads, were correct.  
 19 Q. Well, you were being presented as a serious and  
 20 experienced former intelligence officer whose research  
 21 could be trusted and you were being presented to all  
 22 these journalists as someone who was worth listening to,  
 23 weren't you?  
 24 A. That's true.  
 25 Q. Mr Simpson wasn't saying, "Here's my old friend

166

1 Christopher Steele, he's a bit of a fantasist and he's  
 2 made up quite a lot of stuff but maybe you want to  
 3 investigate as well", was he?  
 4 A. No, he was presenting me as somebody who was a serious  
 5 professional.  
 6 Q. Yes. This was therefore being used for political  
 7 campaigning purposes. It's obvious, isn't it,  
 8 Mr Steele?  
 9 A. I think that's too crude a way of putting it.  
 10 Q. How many reports did you produce for the Clinton  
 11 presidential campaign?  
 12 A. Within the bounds of the contract?  
 13 Q. Yes.  
 14 A. 16, I believe.  
 15 Q. You see, the numbers run from 80 to 166. So there  
 16 appear to be 70 missing reports in that sequence. What  
 17 are they about?  
 18 A. Within Orbis every report, no matter which project it is  
 19 being produced on, is given a consecutive number. So  
 20 there is no significance in -- the numbers that are  
 21 missing, if you like, are numbers that refer to reports  
 22 that were going into other project work.  
 23 Q. Are you sure that these are the only reports?  
 24 A. There were 16 memos produced subject to the contract.  
 25 There was a note at the end of November that referred to

167

1 Mitt Romney becoming Secretary of State, and there was  
 2 a December memorandum that was produced, I think  
 3 13 December, which was after the contract had expired.  
 4 Q. What about number 87?  
 5 A. I wouldn't know offhand, sorry, which --  
 6 Q. You see, number 87 isn't in the reports published by  
 7 BuzzFeed, but it appears to be one you gave to the FBI.  
 8 If you look at your --  
 9 A. Could you expand on that? Because I'm not --  
 10 Q. Yes, if you look at your note at [D/55.1/1]. I think it  
 11 is still up now. If we have a list here, we were  
 12 presented with reports 2016/88, 2016/87 --  
 13 A. Oh, yes.  
 14 Q. -- 86 and 80?  
 15 A. Yeah. Yeah, yeah.  
 16 Q. Now --  
 17 A. Can I explain that?  
 18 Q. Yes.  
 19 A. They are pursuant to different work for the FBI. They  
 20 are not relevant to -- that report was not concerning  
 21 the Trump-Russia issue. It was some other issue, as was  
 22 88, presumably.  
 23 Q. Well, all the other numbers are in the reports published  
 24 by BuzzFeed, but 87 isn't.  
 25 A. Could I explain again, just to be clear, your Lordship,

168