

Sayers, Margery

From: joel hurewitz <joelhurewitz@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 23, 2020 6:07 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: CB7-2020 - Protect Whistleblowers

[Note: This email originated from outside of the organization. Please only click on links or attachments if you know the sender.]

Dear Council,

I support CB7-2020 to protect Howard County whistleblowers. We have all seen the effect that one person who observes wrongdoing can have on our government, the President, our country, and the course of history because of the whistleblower who initiated the investigation that led to the President's impeachment and trial in the Senate. To illustrate the need for whistleblower protection, I submit an excerpt from the closing statements of Impeachment Manager Adam Schiff from January 24, 2020 at the Trump Impeachment Trial in the United States Senate:

Adam Schiff: [\(20:39\)](#)

Now, you'll hear, "Oh, Chairman Schiff was so unfair. He wouldn't allow us to ask our questions." Well, there were certain questions I didn't allow. Questions like, who's the whistleblower? Because we want to punish that whistle blower. Because yes, some of us in this house and in this house believe we ought to protect whistle blowers. So yes, I did not allow the outing of the whistleblower. So when they say the chairman wouldn't allow certain questions, that's what they mean. That means that we protect people who have the courage to come forward and blow the whistle. That we don't think, though the president might, that they're traitors and spiced. To believe that someone who blows the whistle on misconduct of the serious nature that you now know took place is a traitor or a spy. There is only one way you can come to that conclusion. And that is if you believe you are the state and that anything that contradicts you is treason. That is the only way that you can conceive of someone who exposes wrongdoing is a trader or a spy. But that is exactly how this president views those who expose his wrongdoing because he is the state. Like any good Monarch, he is the state.

* * * *

Adam Schiff: [\(31:44\)](#)

Now, you'll also hear, as part of the defense, and you heard this from Jay Sekulow, was I think the last thing he said, "The whistleblower," and then he stepped back to the table. The whistleblower. Now, I don't really know what that meant, but I suspect you'll hear more of that. The whistleblower. The whistleblower. It's his, or her fault that we're here. The whistleblower.

Adam Schiff: [\(32:13\)](#)

I would encourage you to read the whistleblower complaint again. When you read that complaint again, you will see just how remarkably accurate it is. It's astonishingly accurate. For all the times the President is out there saying that the complaint was all wrong, "It was all wrong, you read it," now that you have heard the evidence, you read it and you will see how remarkably right the whistleblower got it.

Adam Schiff: [\(32:44\)](#)

Now, when that complaint was filed, it was obviously before we had our depositions, and had our

hearings. All of which obviated the need for the whistleblower. In the beginning we wanted the whistleblower to come and testify, because all we knew about was the complaint. Then, we were able to hear from firsthand witnesses about what happened, and then something else happened. the President and his allies began threatening the whistleblower, and the life of the whistleblower was at risk. What was the point in exposing that whistleblower to the risk of his, or her life when we had the evidence we needed? What was the point, except retribution. Retribution, and the President wants it still.

Adam Schiff: [\(33:38\)](#)

You know why the President is mad at the whistleblower? Because, but for the whistleblower, he wouldn't have been caught, and that is an unforgivable sin. He is the State and but for the whistleblower, the President wouldn't have been caught. For that, he's a spy and he's guilty of treason. Now, what does he add to this? Nothing, but retribution. A pound of flesh. You'll also hear the President's defense, "They hate the President. They hate the President. You should not consider the presence misconduct because they hate the President." Now, what I have said, I leave you to your own judgments about the President. I only hate what he's done to this country. I grieve for what he's done to this country. When they make the argument to you that this is only happening because they hate the President, it is just another of the myriad forms of, please do not consider what the President did. Whether you like the President, or you dislike the President is immaterial. It's all about the constitution, and his misconduct. If it meets the standard of impeachable conduct as we approved, it doesn't matter what you like him. It doesn't matter what you dislike him. What matters is whether he is a danger to the country, because he will do it again. None of us can have confidence, based on his record, that he will not do it again because he is telling us every day that he will.

Thank you again for helping to support good government in Howard County.

Sincerely,
Joel Hurewitz