

Barr, William P.

From: Barr, William P.
Sent: Friday, December 28, 2018 3:20 PM
To: (b)(6): Brian Rabbit personal email; (b)(6): Paul Cappuccio personal email; Benczkowski, Brian A.; Engel, Steven A. (OLC)
Subject: Fwd: Comment request

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Woodruff, Betsy" <(b) (6)>
Date: December 28, 2018 at 3:13:52 PM EST
To: (b)(6): AG Barr personal email
Subject: [EXT] Comment request

Hi Bill,

I'm working on a story about the Mueller's impending report to the AG, and one issue that's come up is the possibility that the report will include material that could arguably be covered by executive privilege. The argument would go that executive privilege remained in tact when White House staff spoke with Mueller because he is part of the executive branch, and that it would be punctured if that material were shared with Congress.

I doubt you'll answer this, BUT...shot in the dark: If you're AG and you get the Mueller report, would you redact portions citing witness testimony about conversations they participated in with the president?

My deadline is 7:30pmET today. Feel free to give me a ring if you like - (b) (6). Thanks.

Best,

Betsy Woodruff
Politics Reporter, The Daily Beast
Signal/cell phone: (b) (6)
1825 Connecticut Ave NW, Suite 620, Washington D.C.
<https://www.linkedin.com/in/betsy-woodruff-Daily-Beast/>

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of Kirkland & Ellis LLP or Kirkland & Ellis International LLP. Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return email or by email to postmaster@kirkland.com, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments.

RICHARD BURR, NORTH CAROLINA, CHAIRMAN
MARK R. WARNER, VIRGINIA, VICE CHAIRMAN

JAMES E. RISCH, IDAHO
MARCO RUBIO, FLORIDA
SUSAN M. COLLINS, MAINE
ROY BLUNT, MISSOURI
JAMES LANKFORD, OKLAHOMA
TOM COTTON, ARKANSAS
JOHN CORNYN, TEXAS

DIANNE FEINSTEIN, CALIFORNIA
RON WYDEN, OREGON
MARTIN HEINRICH, NEW MEXICO
ANGUS S. KING, Jr., MAINE
JOE MANCHIN, WEST VIRGINIA
KAMALA HARRIS, CALIFORNIA

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

United States Senate

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-6475

MITCH McCONNELL, KENTUCKY, EX OFFICIO
CHARLES SCHUMER, NEW YORK, EX OFFICIO
JOHN McCAIN, ARIZONA, EX OFFICIO
JACK REED, RHODE ISLAND, EX OFFICIO

CHRISTOPHER A. JOYNER, STAFF DIRECTOR
MICHAEL CASEY, MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR
KELSEY STROUD BAILEY, CHIEF CLERK

December 21, 2018

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

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

Dear Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein:

As you are aware, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence continues to conduct its bipartisan inquiry into Russian interference in the 2016 U.S. elections.

Throughout its investigation, the Committee has gone to great lengths to accommodate concerns raised by the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Special Counsel, while simultaneously fulfilling its Constitutional responsibilities. The Committee must now consider additional measures to obtain testimony from critical witnesses. Some of these actions may touch on DOJ or Special Counsel equities.

In order to move forward with our investigation, we request your appearance in front of members for a closed discussion during the week of January 7, 2019. Our aim is for the Committee to hear directly from you regarding the Department's views.

Please respond as soon as possible in order to facilitate the timely scheduling of this meeting. If you have any questions about the substance of our request, please have your staff contact Committee counsel, Vanessa Le, at 202-228-6117, or Aaron Cooper, at 202-224-1737.

Sincerely,



COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Susan Collins

Pat Leahy

John Conyers

Angus King

Markio

Tom Coburn

Ron Wyden

Dianne Feinstein

Janet Di

Joe R. Kish

Whitman

O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG)

From: O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG)
Sent: Wednesday, January 9, 2019 2:31 PM
To: Engel, Steven A. (OLC)
Cc: Gannon, Curtis E. (OLC); Weinsheimer, Bradley (ODAG)
Subject: RE: Draft letter to SSCI

Thanks

Edward C. O'Callaghan

(b) (6)

From: Engel, Steven A. (OLC) <(b)(6) per OLC >
Sent: Wednesday, January 9, 2019 11:58 AM
To: O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG) <(b) (6)>
Cc: Gannon, Curtis E. (OLC) <(b)(6) per OLC >; Weinsheimer, Bradley (ODAG)
(b) (6)
Subject: Re: Draft letter to SSCI

Sure. Will take a look.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 9, 2019, at 11:10 AM, O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG) <(b) (6)> wrote:

Duplicative Material (Document ID: 0.7.23922.58756)



O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG)

From: O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG)
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2019 9:55 AM
To: Gannon, Curtis E. (OLC)
Cc: Weinsheimer, Bradley (ODAG); Engel, Steven A. (OLC)
Subject: RE: Draft letter to SSCI

Thanks for your attention to this and comments. We will incorporate.

Ed

Edward C. O'Callaghan

(b) (6)

From: Gannon, Curtis E. (OLC) (b)(6) per OLC
Sent: Wednesday, January 9, 2019 8:42 PM
To: O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG) (b) (6)
Cc: Weinsheimer, Bradley (ODAG) (b) (6); Engel, Steven A. (OLC)
(b)(6) per OLC
Subject: RE: Draft letter to SSCI

Ed,

Thanks for the opportunity to review. Here are a few suggestions from OLC. Please let us know if you'd like to discuss.

Curtis

From: O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG) (b) (6)
Sent: Wednesday, January 9, 2019 11:10 AM
To: Engel, Steven A. (OLC) (b)(6) per OLC; Gannon, Curtis E. (OLC) (b)(6) per OLC
Cc: Weinsheimer, Bradley (ODAG) (b) (6)
Subject: Draft letter to SSCI

Duplicative Material (Document ID: 0.7.23922.58756)

Rabbitt, Brian (OLP)

From: Rabbitt, Brian (OLP)
Sent: Saturday, January 12, 2019 7:47 PM
To: Engel, Steven A. (OLC)
Cc: Benczkowski, Brian (CRM)
Subject: RE: WPB Opening Statement / Testimony
Attachments: Barr Letter.pdf

Here is the final letter we gave to Feinstein.

Brian C. Rabbitt
U.S. Department of Justice
Brian.Rabbitt@usdoj.gov
Cell: (b) (6)

From: Engel, Steven A. (OLC) (b)(6) per OLC
Sent: Saturday, January 12, 2019 6:15 PM
To: Rabbitt, Brian (OLP) <(b) (6)>
Cc: Benczkowski, Brian (CRM) <(b) (6)>
Subject: Re: WPB Opening Statement / Testimony

Has the Graham/DiFi letter been distributed throughout the committee? (b)(5) per OLC
(b) (6) ?

Sent from my iPad

On Jan 12, 2019, at 4:53 PM, Rabbitt, Brian (OLP) <(b) (6)> wrote:

Guys – We’d appreciate your thoughts on this if you have the time.

Brian C. Rabbitt
U.S. Department of Justice
(b) (6)
Cell: (b) (6)

From: Rabbitt, Brian (OLP)
Sent: Saturday, January 12, 2019 3:03 PM
To: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA) <(b) (6)> Escalona, Prim F. (OLA)
<(b) (6)> Williams, Beth A (OLP) <(b) (6)> Fragoso,
Michael (OLP) <(b) (6)> Kupec, Kerri (OPA) <(b) (6)>
Subject: WPB Opening Statement / Testimony

All – Attached please find a draft of Bill’s opening statement / testimony. I understand that this needs to be submitted Monday morning, so prompt comments would be appreciated.

Brian C. Rabbitt
U.S. Department of Justice
(b) (6)
Cell: (b) (6)

(b) (6)

<WPB Opening Statement [1.12.19 Draft].docx>

Senator Dianne Feinstein
United States Senate
331 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

January 10, 2019

Dear Senator Feinstein:

Thank you for your letter of December 21, 2018 regarding a memorandum that I drafted earlier last year, a copy of which I provided to the Senate Judiciary Committee last month.

As you note, my memorandum was narrow in scope, addressing only a single obstruction theory that I thought, based on public information, the Special Counsel might have been considering. The memorandum did not address – or in any way question – the Special Counsel’s core investigation into Russian interference in the 2016 election. Indeed, I have known Bob Mueller personally and professionally for 30 years, and I have the utmost respect for him and the important work he is doing. Having appointed and supervised three special counsels myself while Attorney General, I understand that the country needs a credible and thorough investigation into Russia’s efforts to meddle in our democratic process, including the extent to which any Americans were involved. For this reason, it is vitally important that the Special Counsel be permitted to finish his work. I will carry out the Special Counsel regulations scrupulously and in good faith, and I will allow Bob to complete his work.

Given my background, I am naturally interested in legal issues that have significant implications for our country. I have a deep commitment to the law and I enjoy researching, analyzing, and writing about legal issues. I frequently discuss my views with friends, colleagues, and public officials, and I have worked on a number of amicus briefs, written a law review article, published op-eds, spoken publicly on legal issues, and provided testimony to Congress.

In 2017 and 2018, based on public accounts, it appeared to me that the Special Counsel might be considering subpoenaing the President to explore his motives for terminating the FBI director on the theory that the removal may have constituted obstruction under 18 U.S.C. § 1512(c). I was concerned that predicating obstruction under this statute based solely on the removal of an FBI director would stretch the provision beyond its text and intent, and doing so could have implications well beyond the Special Counsel’s investigation. As my thoughts took shape during informal discussions with other lawyers, I eventually decided to reduce my thinking on this issue to writing in a memorandum. I wrote as a private citizen. I was not representing anyone. No one requested that I write the memorandum. I drafted it myself without assistance and based on public information.

As the media has reported, and as I have explained to a number of your colleagues, I provided the memorandum to and had discussions about the issue with lawyers on all sides of the

Special Counsel's investigation, including officials at the Department of Justice and the White House, as well as lawyers for the President. Over time, I also provided the memorandum to several lawyer friends and had discussions about the issue with them and many others.

Thank you for the opportunity to address these issues. I look forward to discussing them further with you and your colleagues at my upcoming hearing.

Sincerely,



William P. Barr

Rabbitt, Brian (OLP)

From: Rabbitt, Brian (OLP)
Sent: Monday, January 14, 2019 2:55 PM
To: Benczkowski, Brian (CRM); Engel, Steven A. (OLC); Burnham, James M. (CIV)
Subject: FW: Letter to Sen. Graham
Attachments: Barr Graham Letter (01.14.19).pdf; Barr Feinstein Letter (01.10.19).pdf

FYI

Brian C. Rabbitt
U.S. Department of Justice

(b) (6)

Cell: (b) (6)

From: Rabbitt, Brian (OLP)
Sent: Monday, January 14, 2019 2:53 PM
To: Kupec, Kerri (OPA) <(b) (6)>
Cc: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA) <(b) (6)> Escalona, Prim F. (OLA) <(b) (6)>
Williams, Beth A (OLP) <(b) (6)> Fragoso, Michael (OLP) <(b) (6)>
Subject: Letter to Sen. Graham

The attached will go to Sen. Graham later today. I am also attaching the Feinstein letter in case it is helpful for context.

Brian C. Rabbitt
U.S. Department of Justice

(b) (6)

Cell: (b) (6)

The Honorable Lindsay Graham
Chairman
Senate Committee on the Judiciary
United States Senate
290 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

January 14, 2019

Dear Chairman Graham:

Thank you for taking the time to meet with me last week. I appreciated the opportunity to speak with you about my upcoming hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee and my plans for the Department of Justice if I am confirmed.

During our meeting, you asked me about the legal memorandum that I drafted as a private citizen in June 2018, a copy of which I provided to the Committee last month. Although the memorandum is publicly available and has been the subject of extensive reporting, I believe there may still be some confusion as to what my memorandum did, and did not, address.

As I explained in my January 10, 2019 letter responding to questions posed by Ranking Member Feinstein, the memorandum did not address or in any way question the Special Counsel's core investigation into Russian efforts to interfere with the 2016 election. Indeed, I have known Bob Mueller personally and professionally for 30 years, and I have the utmost respect for him and the important work he is doing. When Bob was appointed, I publicly praised his selection and expressed confidence that he would handle the investigation properly. As I noted during our discussion, I personally appointed and supervised three special counsels myself while serving as Attorney General. I also authorized an independent counsel under the Ethics in Government Act. I believe the country needs a credible and thorough investigation into Russia's efforts to meddle in our democratic process, including the extent of any collusion by Americans, and thus feel strongly that that the Special Counsel must be permitted to finish his work. I assured you during our meeting and I reiterate here that, if confirmed, I will follow the Special Counsel regulations scrupulously and in good faith, and I will allow Bob to complete his investigation.

As for the memorandum itself, as we discussed during our meeting, the memorandum's analysis was narrow in scope. It addressed a single obstruction-of-justice theory under a specific federal statute, 18 U.S.C. § 1512(c), that I thought, based on public information, Special Counsel Mueller might have been considering at the time. The memorandum did not address any of the other obstruction theories that have been publicly discussed in connection with the Special Counsel's investigation.

The principal conclusion of my memo is that the actions prohibited by section 1512(c) are, generally speaking, the hiding, withholding, destroying, or altering of evidence in other words, acts that impair the availability or integrity of evidence in a proceeding. The memorandum did not suggest that a President can never obstruct justice. Quite the contrary, it expressed my belief that a President, just like anyone else, can obstruct justice if he or she engages in wrongful actions that impair the availability of evidence. Nor did the memorandum claim, as some have incorrectly suggested, that a President can never obstruct justice whenever he or she is exercising a constitutional function. If a President, acting with the requisite intent, engages in the kind of evidence impairment the statute prohibits regardless whether it involves the exercise of his or her constitutional powers or not then a President commits obstruction of justice under the statute. It is as simple as that.

During our meeting, you asked why I drafted the memorandum. I explained that, as a former Attorney General, I am naturally interested in significant legal issues of public import, and I frequently offer my views on legal issues of the day sometimes in discussions directly with public officials; sometimes in published op-eds; sometimes in amicus briefs; and sometimes in Congressional testimony. For example, immediately after the attacks of September 11, 2001, I reached out to a number of officials in the Bush administration to express my view that foreign terrorists were enemy combatants subject to the laws of war and should be tried before military commissions, and I directed the administration to supporting legal materials I previously had prepared during my time at the Department. More recently, I have offered my views to officials at the Department on a number of legal issues, such as concerns about the prosecution of Senator Bob Menendez.

In 2017 and 2018, much of the news media was saturated with commentary and speculation about various obstruction theories that the Special Counsel may have been pursuing at the time, including theories under section 1512(c). I decided to weigh in because I was worried that, if an overly expansive interpretation of section 1512(c) were adopted in this particular case, it could, over the longer term, cast a pall over the exercise of discretionary authority, not just by future Presidents, but by all public officials involved in administering the law, especially those in the Department. I started drafting an op-ed. But as I wrote, I quickly realized that the subject matter was too dry and would require too much space. Further, my purpose was not to influence public opinion on the issue, but rather to make sure that all of the lawyers involved carefully considered the potential implications of the theory. I discussed my views broadly with lawyer friends; wrote the memo to senior Department officials; shared it with other interested parties; and later provided copies to friends. I was not representing anyone when I wrote the memorandum, and no one requested that I draft it. I wrote it myself, on my own initiative, without assistance, and based solely on public information.

You requested that I provide you with additional information concerning the lawyers with whom I shared the memorandum or discussed the issue it addresses. As the media has reported, I provided the memorandum to officials at the Department of Justice and lawyers for the President. To the best of my recollection, before I began writing the memorandum, I provided

my views on the issue to Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein at lunch in early 2018. Later, on a separate occasion, I also briefly provided my views to Assistant Attorney General Steven Engel. After drafting the memorandum, I provided copies to both of them. I also sent it to Solicitor General Noel Francisco after I saw him at a social gathering. During my interactions with these Department officials, I neither solicited nor received any information about the Special Counsel's investigation. In addition to sharing my views with the Department, I thought they also might be of interest to other lawyers working on the matter. I thus sent a copy of the memorandum and discussed those views with White House Special Counsel Emmet Flood. I also sent a copy to Pat Cipollone, who had worked for me at the Department of Justice, and discussed the issues raised in the memo with him and a few other lawyers for the President, namely Marty and Jane Raskin and Jay Sekulow. The purpose of those discussions was to explain my views.

As I explained during our meeting, I frequently discuss legal issues informally with lawyers, and it is possible that I shared the memorandum or discussed my thinking reflected in the memorandum with other people in addition to those mentioned above, including some who have represented clients in connection with the Special Counsel's work. At this time, I also recall providing the memorandum to, and/or having conversations about its contents with, the following:

- Professor Bradford Clark
- Richard Cullen
- Eric Herschmann
- Abbe Lowell
- Andrew McBride
- Patrick Rowan
- George Terwilliger
- Professor Jonathan Turley
- Thomas Yannucci

The foregoing represents my best recollection on these issues at this time. I look forward to discussing these issues further with you and your colleagues at my upcoming hearing.

Sincerely,



William P. Barr

Engel, Steven A. (OLC)

From: Engel, Steven A. (OLC)
Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2019 5:28 PM
To: William Barr
Subject: RE: Call me after you've read this

Great.

From: William Barr (b)(6): AG Barr personal email
Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2019 5:25 PM
To: Engel, Steven A. (OLC) (b)(6) per OLC
Subject: Re: Call me after you've read this

Yes. I think I can get through without going beyond where I am already. I'll let you know if it turns out I'm wrong.
Bill

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 30, 2019, at 5:23 PM, Engel, Steven A. (OLC) (b)(6) per OLC wrote:

Thanks. Reviewed. Let me know if you want to discuss more.

FYI, the Hill quotes Graham as saying, "I would just trust the guy to make good judgments." That is rendered slightly differently below ("and I just try [Barr] to make good judgments"), but it seems garbled here.

From: William Barr (b)(6): AG Barr personal email
Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2019 4:19 PM
To: Engel, Steven A. (OLC) (b)(6) per OLC
Subject: Fwd: Call me after you've read this

Please read below.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Rabbitt, Brian (OLP)" (b) (6)
Date: January 30, 2019 at 4:00:38 PM EST
To: (b)(6): AG Barr pers (b) (6)
Subject: Fwd: Call me after you've read this

Brian C. Rabbitt

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Ferguson, Andrew (Judiciary-Rep)"

(b) (6)

Date: January 30, 2019 at 3:32:30 PM EST

To: "Rabbitt, Brian (OLP)" <(b) (6)>

Subject: Call me after you've read this

Beginning at 40:54:

WHITEHOUSE: His topline was terrific. He wants to be as transparent as possible consistent with the law. But we're both lawyers, and we both know that there are weasel words that can be put into sentences. And the question of what transparency is consistent with the law is a ginormous loophole in his transparency pledge. And there are two specific areas where I think we should have concern about that ginormous loophole. The first is the Department's tradition that it does not release derogatory investigative information about an uncharged person. This is the rule that Jim Comey violated so flagrantly and so inexcusably. The question how that rule applies to this report is an interesting one. And the particular question that is of interest is: what if the reason that President Trump is an uncharged person within the meaning of that Department's tradition is the OLC opinion that says you can't indict a sitting president? What if there actually is an indictment-worthy case to be made and they then take the position that "well, he's an uncharged person, and therefore this is derogatory information and we're not going to talk about it." There are a million reasons why in the special counsel context when the President of the United States is a target, that rule creates—there are a whole bunch of new considerations. But it ought to be a very simple one, that if the only reason he's an uncharged person is because of OLC's internal, untested, never-signed-off-on-by-any-judge policy, it makes him an uncharged person—we gotta get to the bottom of that. That's, I think, a worthy question for this Committee to settle, before we're asked to vote on this guy.

The second is, the reason that he refuses to be transparent about the special counsel report by reason of the law has to do with an assertion of executive privilege by the White House. Particularly, again, an assertion by the White House completely untested in any court. He just says "we're going with it." That takes the transparency of the report out of the special counsel process and the hands of the Attorney General and moves it over to White House Counsel. And I think we have a serious concern about that problem because in this Committee, we have seen such fragrant—sorry—flagrantly false and bogus assertions of executive privilege by this Administration already. So, again, these are two enormous windows that could be closed with clear answers and I hope very much that we can get those answers before we're obliged to vote on Mr. Barr.

The question of executive privilege causes me to revive questions that I asked the previous Chairman that I think would be productive areas for this Committee to do some work. The first is I think it's appropriate for the Congress to know what a President of the United States has by way of foreign business interests. That seems to me a pretty straightforward

question and one that's pretty hard to defend and answer "no, we don't need to know that." So, I think we need to get an answer to that and I proposed to Chairman Grassley that you—we bring in somebody who is respected and neutral and can do a study for us like a forensic accounting report that says "here are the foreign business interests of the President." I think we need to get to the bottom of executive privilege and come up with a Committee process and rule about when we will accept the assertion and when we won't. Because we've been extraordinarily sloppy about allowing executive officials to get away with non-assertion assertions of the privilege. I think that we oughta take a look at whether Donald Trump, Jr. was truthful to our Committee. There have been very public questions raised about whether he was truthful or not. We are the Committee before which he testified. Those seem to be reasonable answers to try to run down. Any witness who isn't truthful to our Committee, that's a question that we oughta take a look at. And finally, I've raised before and I'll raise again, I don't know that the House would ever look at it, the prospect that there was coordination between House members or staff and the Trump team to use the House and congressional oversight as a means for trying to sabotage or impede the special counsel investigation remains to me an open question. So, I just wanted to flag those again, I've raised those all before with the previous Chairman. And I thank you for your patience. I know you're the only member of the Republican party here right now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well I think y'all are very interesting. I don't know about the other people up here. That's a good point I hadn't thought about that. Uh, what if the legal counsel, the OLC folks said you can't indict a sitting president so therefore [pause] yeah [pause] so we'll talk to him...

WHITEHOUSE: I think we could get that questions answered.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah I think that's a good question to get answered.

WHITEHOUSE: And I think ditto getting a responsible view of the of the executive privilege assertion if that's gonna be ...

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah, absolutely.

WHITEHOUSE: An assertion that prevents release of the transcript...

THE CHAIRMAN: Yep.

WHITEHOUSE: I don't know why they're being dodgy about those answers but well it looks suspiciously like...

THE CHAIRMAN: We'll give him a call, we'll give him a call.

WHITEHOUSE: Dodgy answers, thank you.

Beginning at 54:15:

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mueller in my view is not on a witch hunt. He'll be allowed to do his job. It'll be good for the country. And when

that report is finished, I wanna find out as much about it as you do. But the regulation doesn't prohibit [the Attorney General] from giving us the report, you're right. But he does have discretion, and I just try [Barr] to make good judgments. But I do want to talk to him about the OLC concept. Institutionally, that's a pretty interesting—if you agree you can't indict the President that's probably not a good reason not to share with us the derogatory information. And executive privilege, you have to really watch about that being used to deny transparency, because that's a pretty easy way to stop things. So we'll talk to Mr. Barr about that.

Beginning at 1:15:52:

THE CHAIRMAN: I'll try to be fair the best I know how to be. The OLC office being used to knock out information to the public is really a legitimate question, executive privilege claim by any white house as a reason not to divulge information is a legitimate question because you could use those two things to really shut down what the public gets and I'll talk to Mr. Barr about that with some of the members of the Committee that are interested [gestures to Senator Whitehouse].

O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG)

From: O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG)
Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2019 6:59 PM
To: Engel, Steven A. (OLC); Lasseter, David F. (OLA); Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA); Weinsheimer, Bradley (ODAG); Gannon, Curtis E. (OLC)
Cc: Scott, McGregor (USACAE)
Subject: RE: A/AG responses related to SCO questions

I generally agree but suggest (b) (5)

Edward C. O'Callaghan

(b) (6)

From: Engel, Steven A. (OLC) (b)(6) per OLC >
Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2019 5:59 PM
To: Lasseter, David F. (OLA) <(b) (6)> Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA) <(b) (6)>
O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG) <(b) (6)> Weinsheimer, Bradley (ODAG)
<bradweinshe(b) (6)> Gannon, Curtis E. (OLC) (b)(6) per OLC
Cc: Scott, McGregor (USACAE) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: A/AG responses related to SCO questions

Happy to meet if needed. I'd be available at 3 pm. (b)(5) per OLC

Here's what I would do for the Q&A's.

(b)(5) per OLC

From: Lasseter, David F. (OLA) <(b) (6)>
Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2019 1:45 PM
To: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA) <(b) (6)> O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG)
<(b) (6)> Weinsheimer, Bradley (ODAG) <(b) (6)> Engel,
Steven A. (OLC) <(b)(6) per OLC> Gannon, Curtis E. (OLC) <(b)(6) per OLC >
Cc: Scott, McGregor (USACAE) <(b) (6)>
Subject: A/AG responses related to SCO questions

Good afternoon all. After hearing the responses to SCO related questions in yesterday's moot I think it would be prudent to decide how best to answer these questions. I want to ensure uniformity in the responses.



(b) (5)

Perhaps we could discuss these along with executive privilege tomorrow. I would offer 11am, 1pm, or 3pm tomorrow.

Thanks,
David

David F. Lasseter
Deputy Assistant Attorney General
Office of Legislative Affairs
U.S. Department of Justice

(b) (6)

Scott, McGregor (USACAE)

From: Scott, McGregor (USACAE)
Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2019 7:53 PM
To: Lasseter, David F. (OLA)
Cc: O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG); Engel, Steven A. (OLC); Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA); Weinsheimer, Bradley (ODAG); Gannon, Curtis E. (OLC)
Subject: Re: A/AG responses related to SCO questions

Agreed.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 30, 2019, at 4:46 PM, Lasseter, David F. (OLA) (b) (6) wrote:

Thanks Gentlemen. If we have concurrence with respect to the SCO questions then we likely don't need to meet to discuss. (b) (5). Unless there is a difference of opinion we will plan to go this route.

David F. Lasseter

On Jan 30, 2019, at 19:29, O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG) (b) (6) wrote:

To clarify, I didn't mean to suggest that (b) (5). Steve's general answers seem right to me. I would suggest modifying (b) (5) to include the language:

(b) (5)

Edward C. O'Callaghan
202-514-2105

From: Engel, Steven A. (OLC) <(b)(6) per OLC>
Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2019 5:59 PM
To: Lasseter, David F. (OLA) <(b) (6)>; Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA) <(b) (6)>; O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG) <(b) (6)>; Weinsheimer, Bradley (ODAG) <(b) (6)>; Gannon, Curtis E. (OLC) <(b) (6) per OLC>
Cc: Scott, McGregor (USACAE) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: A/AG responses related to SCO questions

Duplicative Material (Document ID: 0.7.23922.57204)

Engel, Steven A. (OLC)

From: Engel, Steven A. (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 11:13 AM
To: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA); Lasseter, David F. (OLA); Weinsheimer, Bradley (ODAG)
Subject: RE: Whitaker Testimony
Attachments: (b)(5) per OLC Q&A.docx; (b)(5) per OLC Q&As.docx

Related to this subject, if you haven't received these through other channels, attached are some Q&As (b)(5) per OLC.

From: Lasseter, David F. (OLA) <(b) (6)>
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 10:19 AM
To: Engel, Steven A. (OLC) (b)(6) per OLC; Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: Whitaker Testimony

This is not completely accurate but we do need to gather to discuss this and EP. Today would be best.

From: Engel, Steven A. (OLC) (b)(6) per OLC
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 10:14 AM
To: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA) <(b) (6)> Lasseter, David F. (OLA) <(b) (6)>
Subject: FW: Whitaker Testimony

Have you heard anything about this? News to me?

From: Colborn, Paul P (OLC) <(b)(6) per OLC>
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 10:12 AM
To: Engel, Steven A. (OLC) (b)(6) per OLC; Gannon, Curtis E. (OLC) (b)(6) per OLC
Subject: Whitaker Testimony

(b)(5) per OLC

Do you know if this is true?

I don't see anything on the HJC website. It doesn't appear to have been updated in the new Congress.

Weinsheimer, Bradley (ODAG)

From: Weinsheimer, Bradley (ODAG)
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 12:16 PM
To: Engel, Steven A. (OLC)
Cc: Gannon, Curtis E. (OLC); Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA); Lasseter, David F. (OLA)
Subject: RE: Whitaker Testimony
Attachments: Nadler QAs (002) GBW.docx

On the (b) (5) issue, I suggest (b) (5) [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

I also edited to (b) (5) [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Thanks, Brad.

From: Engel, Steven A. (OLC) (b)(6) per OLC
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 11:13 AM
To: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA) (b) (6) Lasseter, David F. (OLA) (b) (6)
Weinsheimer, Bradley (ODAG) (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Whitaker Testimony

Duplicative Material (Document ID: 0.7.23922.57664)

Engel, Steven A. (OLC)

From: Engel, Steven A. (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, February 5, 2019 9:25 AM
To: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA); Lasseter, David F. (OLA); de la Torre, Lindsey (OAG); Scott, McGregor (USACAE); O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG); Weinsheimer, Bradley (ODAG)
Cc: Gannon, Curtis E. (OLC); Colborn, Paul P (OLC)
Subject: RE: Boyd Letter to Chairman Nadler
Attachments: Draft Response to Chairman Nadler 2-4-19.docx

Adding Ed and Brad.

From: Engel, Steven A. (OLC)
Sent: Monday, February 4, 2019 7:31 PM
To: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA) (b) (6) Lasseter, David F. (OLA)
(b) (6) de la Torre, Lindsey (OAG) (b) (6) Scott, McGregor
(USACAE) (b) (6)
Cc: Gannon, Curtis E. (OLC) (b)(6) per OLC Paul P Colborn (OLC)
(b)(6) per OLC (b)(6) per OLC
Subject: Boyd Letter to Chairman Nadler

Attached is the draft letter responding to Chairman Nadler's January 22 letter.

<< File: Draft Response to Chairman Nadler 2-4-19.docx >>

Steven A. Engel
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Legal Counsel
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530
Office (b)(6) per OLC
(b)(6) per OLC

Engel, Steven A. (OLC)

From: Engel, Steven A. (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, February 5, 2019 11:45 AM
To: O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG)
Subject: FW: NADLER STATEMENT ON NOTICE OF MARKUP AHEAD OF WHITAKER HEARING

From: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA) <(b) (6)>
Sent: Tuesday, February 5, 2019 10:29 AM
To: Kupec, Kerri (OPA) <(b) (6)> Barnett, Gary E. (OAG) <(b) (6)>
Escalona, Prim F. (OLA) <(b) (6)> Lasseeter, David F. (OLA)
<(b) (6)> Colborn, Paul P (OLC) <(b)(6) per OLC >; Engel, Steven A. (OLC)
<(b)(6) per OLC >
Subject: RE: NADLER STATEMENT ON NOTICE OF MARKUP AHEAD OF WHITAKER HEARING

This is not a surprise, but we should probably consider (b) (5) . Welcome everyone's thoughts. SB

From: Kupec, Kerri (OPA) <(b) (6)>
Sent: Tuesday, February 5, 2019 10:25 AM
To: Barnett, Gary E. (OAG) <(b) (6)> Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA)
<(b) (6)> Escalona, Prim F. (OLA) <(b) (6)>
Subject: FW: NADLER STATEMENT ON NOTICE OF MARKUP AHEAD OF WHITAKER HEARING

Thoughts?

From: Lynch, Sarah N. (Reuters) <(b) (6)>
Sent: Tuesday, February 5, 2019 10:16 AM
To: Kupec, Kerri (OPA) <(b) (6)>
Subject: FW: NADLER STATEMENT ON NOTICE OF MARKUP AHEAD OF WHITAKER HEARING

Hiya

Do you have any comment on this?

Gracias

Correspondent on Criminal Justice
Thomson Reuters
1333 H Street NW Suite 600
Washington DC 20005
Office: (b) (6)
Cell/Signal/WhatsApp: (b) (6)
Justice Department Number: (b) (6)
(b) (6)

Follow me on Twitter @sarahlynch
Investigative tips always welcome....

From: Reddick-Smith, Shadawn (b) (6) >
Sent: Tuesday, February 05, 2019 10:02 AM
To: Reddick-Smith, Shadawn <(b) (6)>; Schwarz, Daniel
<(b) (6)>
Subject: NADLER STATEMENT ON NOTICE OF MARKUP AHEAD OF WHITAKER HEARING



Stay informed and connected: Judiciary.House.Gov/[@HouseJudiciary](https://twitter.com/HouseJudiciary)

For Immediate Release

February 5, 2019

Contacts:

[Shadawn Reddick-Smith](mailto:Shadawn.Reddick-Smith@house.gov) 202-225-3951

[Daniel Schwarz](mailto:Daniel.Schwarz@house.gov) 202-225-5635

NADLER STATEMENT ON NOTICE OF MARKUP AHEAD OF WHITAKER HEARING

Washington, D.C. – House Judiciary Committee Chairman Jerrold Nadler (D-NY) released the following statement on scheduling a markup of a resolution to authorize a subpoena for Acting Attorney General Matthew Whitaker on February 7, 2019:

“For the first two years of the Trump Administration, Congress allowed government witnesses to dodge uncomfortable questions. That era is over. In an abundance of caution—to ensure that Mr. Whitaker both appears in the hearing room on Friday morning and answers our questions clearly—I have asked the Committee to authorize me to issue a subpoena to compel his testimony.

“To be clear, I hope never to use this subpoena. Weeks ago, we gave Mr. Whitaker a list of questions we hope to ask him about his communications with the White House and his refusal to recuse himself from oversight of the Special Counsel’s investigation. If he appears on time and ready to answer those questions, the subpoena will be entirely unnecessary.

“I intend to be fully transparent about this process. I shared my plans with Ranking Member Collins last week and, when he expressed reservations, we scheduled this authorizing resolution for a markup. There need not be surprises here. We have been quite public about our intention to obtain this information from Mr. Whitaker.”

The Committee also announced it will be marking up H.R. 948, the “No Oil Producing and Exporting

The Committee also announced it will be marking up H.R. 748, the "Oil Producing and Exporting Cartels Act of 2019," bipartisan legislation introduced by Rep. Steve Chabot (R-OH), Chairman Nadler, Subcommittee Chairman David N. Cicilline (D-RI), and Subcommittee Ranking Member Jim Sensenbrenner (R-WI).

###

Weinsheimer, Bradley (ODAG)

From: Weinsheimer, Bradley (ODAG)
Sent: Tuesday, February 5, 2019 12:25 PM
To: Barnett, Gary E. (OAG); Engel, Steven A. (OLC)
Cc: Kupec, Kerri (OPA); Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA); Escalona, Prim F. (OLA); Lasseter, David F. (OLA); Colborn, Paul P (OLC); O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG); Scott, McGregor (USACAE); de la Torre, Lindsey (OAG)
Subject: RE: NADLER STATEMENT ON NOTICE OF MARKUP AHEAD OF WHITAKER HEARING

(b) (5)
[Redacted]
[Redacted] Thanks, Brad.

From: Barnett, Gary E. (OAG) <(b) (6)>
Sent: Tuesday, February 5, 2019 12:13 PM
To: Engel, Steven A. (OLC) (b)(6) per OLC
Cc: Kupec, Kerri (OPA) <(b) (6)> Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA) <(b) (6)>
Escalona, Prim F. (OLA) <pfesca(b) (6)> Lasseter, David F. (OLA) <(b) (6)>
Colborn, Paul P (OLC) (b)(6) per OLC O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG)
<(b) (6)> Weinsheimer, Bradley (ODAG) <bradwe(b) (6)> Scott,
McGregor (USACAE) <(b) (6)> de la Torre, Lindsey (OAG) <(b) (6)>
Subject: Re: NADLER STATEMENT ON NOTICE OF MARKUP AHEAD OF WHITAKER HEARING

Plus Greg and Lindsey

On Feb 5, 2019, at 12:11 PM, Engel, Steven A. (OLC) (b)(6) per OLC wrote:

(b)(5) per OLC
(b)(5) per OLC I
attach the current draft of the letter. (b)(5) per OLC
(b)(5) per OLC
(b)(5) per OLC
(b)(5) per OLC
(b)(5) per OLC
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

From: Kupec, Kerri (OPA) <(b) (6)>
Sent: Tuesday, February 5, 2019 10:59 AM
To: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA) <se(b) (6)> Barnett, Gary E. (OAG)
<(b) (6)> Escalona, Prim F. (OLA) <(b) (6)> >; Lasseter,
David F. (OLA) (b) (6) >; Colborn, Paul P (OLC) (b)(6) per OLC

Engel, Steven A. (OLC) (b)(6) per OLC

Subject: RE: NADLER STATEMENT ON NOTICE OF MARKUP AHEAD OF WHITAKER HEARING

Something like:

(b) (5)

From: Kupec, Kerri (OPA)

Sent: Tuesday, February 5, 2019 10:32 AM

To: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA) (b) (6) Barnett, Gary E. (OAG)

<gebarnett@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Escalona, Prim F. (OLA) (b) (6) Lasseeter,

David F. (OLA) (b) (6) Colborn, Paul P (OLC) (b)(6) per OLC

Engel, Steven A. (OLC) (b)(6) per OLC

Subject: RE: NADLER STATEMENT ON NOTICE OF MARKUP AHEAD OF WHITAKER HEARING

Agreed. It's offensive, even for him.

From: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA) (b) (6)

Sent: Tuesday, February 5, 2019 10:29 AM

To: Kupec, Kerri (OPA) (b) (6) Barnett, Gary E. (OAG)

(b) (6) Escalona, Prim F. (OLA) (b) (6) Lasseeter,

David F. (OLA) (b) (6) Colborn, Paul P (OLC) (b)(6) per OLC

Engel, Steven A. (OLC) (b)(6) per OLC >

Subject: RE: NADLER STATEMENT ON NOTICE OF MARKUP AHEAD OF WHITAKER HEARING

Duplicative Material (Document ID: 0.7.23922.63790)

Engel, Steven A. (OLC)

From: Engel, Steven A. (OLC)
Sent: Wednesday, February 6, 2019 9:42 PM
To: O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG); Weinsheimer, Bradley (ODAG)
Subject: Fwd: Draft Response to Chairman Nadler 2-4-19 (002) - SB + sae - Wed PM
Attachments: Draft Response to Chairman Nadler 2-4-19 (002) - SB + sae - Wed PM.docx; ATT00001.htm

FYI, here's the latest. The Ranking Member (Doug Collins) strongly requested that we not send before tomorrow morning's vote. (b)(5) per OLC

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA)" <(b) (6)>
Date: February 6, 2019 at 9:27:09 PM EST
To: "Hankey, Mary Blanche (OLA)" <(b) (6)>, "Escalona, Prim F. (OLA)" <(b) (6)>, "Lasseter, David F. (OLA)" <(b) (6)>, "de la Torre, Lindsey (OAG)" <(b) (6)>, "Barnett, Gary E. (OAG)" <(b) (6)>, "Scott, McGregor (USACAE)" <(b) (6)>, "Gannon, Curtis E. (OLC)" <(b) (6)>, "Engel, Steven A. (OLC)" <(b)(6) per OLC>, "Morrissey, Brian (OAG)" <(b) (6)>, "Francisco, Noel (OSG)" <(b) (6)>, "Benczkowski, Brian (CRM)" <(b) (6)>, "Kupec, Kerri (OPA)" <(b) (6)>
Subject: Draft Response to Chairman Nadler 2-4-19 (002) - SB + sae - Wed PM

Team:

Please see the attached draft response for tomorrow. We hope to respond NLT than 12:30 PM ET.

This version incorporates my edits plus helpful input from Steve and Curtis.

All suggestions welcome. I will be on the Hill in the AM with Barr, so I'll need to ask Mary Blanche and Lasseter to manage any late revisions/edits.

Thanks all –

SB

Engel, Steven A. (OLC)

From: Engel, Steven A. (OLC)
Sent: Wednesday, February 6, 2019 11:02 PM
To: Weinsheimer, Bradley (ODAG)
Cc: O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG)
Subject: Re: Draft Response to Chairman Nadler 2-4-19 (002) - SB + sae - Wed PM

Thanks, Brad. Will take a look in the morning.

Sent from my iPad

On Feb 6, 2019, at 9:56 PM, Weinsheimer, Bradley (ODAG) <(b) (6)> wrote:

Thanks Steve. (b) (5)
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted].

Thanks, Brad.

On Feb 6, 2019, at 9:41 PM, Engel, Steven A. (OLC) <(b)(6) per OLC> wrote:

Duplicative Material (Document ID: 0.7.23922.64316)



de la Torre, Lindsey (OAG)

From: de la Torre, Lindsey (OAG)
Sent: Thursday, February 7, 2019 9:11 AM
To: Engel, Steven A. (OLC); Benczkowski, Brian (CRM); Francisco, Noel (OSG); Barnett, Gary E. (OAG); Hamilton, Gene (OAG); Morrissey, Brian (OAG); Levi, William (OAG); Lasseter, David F. (OLA); Scott, McGregor (USACAE); Kupec, Kerri (OPA)
Subject: Today's moot
Attachments: Oversight Hearing Moot 4.docx

Thanks for all of your efforts in preparing for the hearing. Please see topics for today's moot attached.
Thanks!

- I. A/AG opening statement. 5 minutes.
- II. Three 5-minute rounds. 15 minutes.
- III. Review of responses. 5 minutes
- IV. Repeat rounds and review.

Oversight Hearing Moot #4 Questioner Order

Acting Attorney General Matthew Whitaker

1. Brian Benzckowski—(b) (5) [REDACTED]
2. Noel Francisco (b) (5) [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
3. Stephen Boyd (b) (5) [REDACTED]
4. David Lassiter—(b) (5) [REDACTED]
5. Greg Scott (b) (5) [REDACTED]
6. Steve Engel— [REDACTED] (b) (5)
[REDACTED]
7. Gene Hamilton—(b) (5) [REDACTED]
8. William Levi (b) (5) [REDACTED]

Engel, Steven A. (OLC)

From: Engel, Steven A. (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, February 7, 2019 9:57 AM
To: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA); Hankey, Mary Blanche (OLA); Escalona, Prim F. (OLA); Lasseter, David F. (OLA); de la Torre, Lindsey (OAG); Barnett, Gary E. (OAG); Scott, McGregor (USACAE); Gannon, Curtis E. (OLC); Morrissey, Brian (OAG); Francisco, Noel (OSG); Benczkowski, Brian (CRM); Kupec, Kerri (OPA)
Subject: RE: Draft Response to Chairman Nadler 2-4-19 (002) - SB + sae - Wed PM
Attachments: Draft Response to Chairman Nadler 2-7-19 Thur am.docx

The attached reflects small edits [REDACTED] (b)(5) per OLC
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] :

[REDACTED] (b)(5) per OLC
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA) <(b) (6)>
Sent: Wednesday, February 6, 2019 9:27 PM
To: Hankey, Mary Blanche (OLA) <(b) (6)> Escalona, Prim F. (OLA) <(b) (6)> Lasseter, David F. (OLA) <(b) (6)> de la Torre, Lindsey (OAG) <(b) (6)> Barnett, Gary E. (OAG) <(b) (6)> Scott, McGregor (USACAE) <(b) (6)> Gannon, Curtis E. (OLC) <(b)(6) per OLC >; Engel, Steven A. (OLC) <(b)(6) per OLC > Morrissey, Brian (OAG) <(b) (6)> Francisco, Noel (OSG) <(b) (6)>; Benczkowski, Brian (CRM) <(b) (6)> Kupec, Kerri (OPA) <(b) (6)>
Subject: Draft Response to Chairman Nadler 2-4-19 (002) - SB + sae - Wed PM

Duplicative Material (Document ID: 0.7.23922.64316)



de la Torre, Lindsey (OAG)

From: de la Torre, Lindsey (OAG)
Sent: Friday, February 8, 2019 6:34 AM
To: Engel, Steven A. (OLC)
Cc: Barnett, Gary E. (OAG); Scott, McGregor (USACAE); Francisco, Noel (OSG); Gannon, Curtis E. (OLC)
Subject: Re: Opening Statement

Thanks Steve. MSNBC reporting that Nadler left wiggle room to issue a subpoena.

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 8, 2019, at 12:04 AM, Engel, Steven A. (OLC) <(b)(6) per OLC> wrote:

(b)(5) per OLC
[Redacted]

Sent from my iPad

On Feb 7, 2019, at 10:56 PM, de la Torre, Lindsey (OAG) <(b) (6)> wrote:

Thanks all!

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 7, 2019, at 10:10 PM, Francisco, Noel (OSG) <(b) (6)> wrote:

Looks good

On Feb 7, 2019, at 10:05 PM, Engel, Steven A. (OLC) <(b)(6) per OLC> wrote:

How about this? The insert is (b)(5) per OLC, bolded below.

(b)(5) per OLC
[Redacted]
(b)(5) per OLC

(b)(5) per OLC [redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

(b)(5) per OLC

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

(b)(5) per OLC

[Redacted text block containing approximately 25 lines of obscured content]

(b)(5) per OLC

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

(b)(5) per OLC

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

the Committee's questions, including those potentially protected by executive privilege. In response, the Department of Justice informed Chairman Nadler that, absent an assurance that the Committee would not issue a subpoena on or before February 8, Acting Attorney General Whitaker would not testify. The Chairman's initial written response refused to make that commitment. In subsequent communications, however, the Chairman has made the commitment that we requested, and agreed that, if Mr. Whitaker voluntarily appears at tomorrow's hearing, the Committee will not issue a subpoena on or before February 8. In light of that commitment, Acting Attorney General Whitaker looks forward to voluntarily appearing at tomorrow's hearing and discussing the great work of the Department of Justice."

<190114 Opening Statement v10 spoken (002).docx>

Engel, Steven A. (OLC)

From: Engel, Steven A. (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, April 30, 2019 9:03 PM
To: Rabbitt, Brian (OAG)
Subject: Fwd: Draft Response Letter to Nadler Subpoena
Attachments: DOJ response to HJC subpoena 4-28.docx; ATT00001.htm

Is this going out tomorrow? Have you guys reviewed?

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Engel, Steven A. (OLC)" <(b)(6) per OLC >
Date: April 28, 2019 at 7:03:55 PM EDT
To: "Moran, John (OAG)" <(b)(6) > "Rabbitt, Brian (OAG)" <(b)(6) > "Burnham, James (OAG)" <(b)(6) > "O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG)" <(b)(6) > "Gannon, Curtis E. (OLC)" <(b)(6) per OLC >, "Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA)" <(b)(6) > "Escalona, Prim F. (OLA)" <(b)(6) > "Kupec, Kerri (OPA)" <(b)(6) >, "Paul P. Colborn (OLC)" <(b)(6) per OLC > <(b)(6) per OLC >
Subject: Draft Response Letter to Nadler Subpoena

I attach a draft letter responding to Nadler's HJC subpoena.

From: Moran, John (OAG) <(b)(6) >
Sent: Friday, April 26, 2019 10:05 PM
To: Rabbitt, Brian (OAG) <(b)(6) > Burnham, James (OAG) <(b)(6) > O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG) <(b)(6) > Engel, Steven A. (OLC) <(b)(6) per OLC >; Gannon, Curtis E. (OLC) <(b)(6) per OLC >; Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA) <(b)(6) > Escalona, Prim F. (OLA) <(b)(6) > Kupec, Kerri (OPA) <(b)(6) >
Subject: DRAFT Written Opening Statement for May 1 Hearing

All:

Attached is a preliminary draft of the AG's written statement for the record for his Wednesday testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee. Under the tentative current plan, (b)(5)

Any and all comments are welcome. It would be great to have everyone's initial comments on Monday morning.

I hope that everyone has a nice weekend.

Regards,

John S. Moran
Deputy Chief of Staff & Counselor to the Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice

(b) (6) (W)

(b) (6) (C)

(b) (6)