

# Congress of the United States

## House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

2157 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6143

MAJORITY (202) 225-5074

MINORITY (202) 225-5051

<https://oversight.house.gov>

November 21, 2025

### Transmitted Electronically

Mr. David E. Kendall  
Senior Counsel  
Williams & Connolly LLP

Dear Mr. Kendall:

The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform (Committee) has received your November 3, 2025 letter outlining your arguments for why former President Bill Clinton (President Clinton) and former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton (Secretary Clinton) should not be required to appear for “live testimony.”<sup>1</sup> The crux of your argument is that the Committee should accept “a written proffer of what little information [the Clintons] may have,” because it is “the most efficient and equitable way to proceed.”<sup>2</sup> The Committee disagrees. You highlight the fact that the Committee elected to forego deposing other individuals subpoenaed as part of this inquiry. However, your assertion conveniently ignores the fact that these individuals affirmed, subject to 18 U.S.C. § 1001, that they lacked any information relevant to the Committee’s investigation or otherwise had serious health issues that prevented their testimony.<sup>3</sup>

As your letter indicates, both President Clinton and Secretary Clinton possess information relevant to the Committee’s investigation:

What we have learned over the years about Jeffrey Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell is abhorrent. **The public’s demand for transparency from its government about their criminality is both understandable and warranted.** Former President Clinton and former Secretary Clinton welcome legitimate oversight in this matter that is grounded in fact. In that regard, **former President Bill Clinton and former Secretary Hillary**

---

<sup>1</sup> Letter from David E. Kendall to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Nov. 3, 2025).

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*

<sup>3</sup> See Letter from Jefferson B. Sessions III, former U.S. Att’y Gen., to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Aug. 28, 2025); Letter from Merrick B. Garland, former U.S. Att’y Gen., to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Sept. 24, 2025); Letter from Robert K. Kelner on behalf of Eric H. Holder, former U.S. Att’y Gen., to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Sept. 26, 2025); Letter from Alberto R. Gonzales, former U.S. Att’y Gen., to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Aug. 22, 2025); Letter from James B. Comey, former Dir. of Fed. Bureau of Investigation, to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Oct. 1, 2025); Letter from Theodore V. Wells Jr. on behalf of Loretta E. Lynch, former U.S. Att’y Gen., to James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform (Oct. 17, 2025).

**Clinton have little to contribute to that legitimate goal**, all of which can be readily submitted on paper.<sup>4</sup>

Given the admission that your clients possess some relevant information, your position amounts to a demand that the Committee forgo in-person testimony potentially relevant to its legislative oversight. The Committee sets the terms of its oversight, including deciding which witnesses to interview, in what order to interview them, and whether or not to compel testimony in a time, place, and manner of its own choosing.<sup>5</sup> Federal courts have consistently held that witnesses may not “impose [their] own conditions upon the manner of [congressional] inquiry.”<sup>6</sup> That is because “a witness does not have the legal right to dictate the conditions under which he will or will not testify”<sup>7</sup> or “to prescribe the conditions under which he may be interrogated by Congress.”<sup>8</sup>

Simply put, the fact that other witnesses may have been afforded certain accommodations is not a defense to a congressional subpoena. The Committee is not obligated to defer to either your or your clients’ determination regarding the importance or quantity of the information they possess; and it declines to do so. Rather, the Committee is entitled to a fulsome examination of this information, which should include the ability to elicit the information in person and to ask relevant follow-up questions. While you argue that the Committee has not provided “a persuasive rationale for why deposing the Clintons is *required* to fulfill the mandate of your investigation,”<sup>9</sup> this misstates the relevant standard. The Committee need only conclude that deposing your clients would be helpful in advancing its investigation. Therefore, the Committee does not find your argument against an in-person deposition in favor of written interrogatories compelling.

Additionally, your suggestion that your clients’ testimony would not be relevant to the stated purposes of the Committee’s investigation because the events in question took place outside of the Clintons’ respective official duties, misses the Committee’s point. It is precisely the fact President Clinton and Secretary Clinton each maintained relationships with Mr. Epstein and Ms. Maxwell in their *personal capacities as private citizens* that is of interest to the Committee.

---

<sup>4</sup> Letter from David E. Kendall to James Comer, *supra* note 1 at p. 3 (emphasis added); *see also id.* at p. 1 (“[W]e believe that allowing them to make a written proffer of what *little* information they may have is the most efficient and equitable way to proceed.”) (emphasis added).

<sup>5</sup> *See, e.g.*, Todd Garvey, CONG. RESEARCH SERV., LSB11093, COMMITTEE DISCRETION IN OBTAINING WITNESS TESTIMONY (Dec. 22, 2023).

<sup>6</sup> *Eisler v. United States*, 170 F.2d 273, 280 (D.C. Cir. 1948).

<sup>7</sup> *United States v. Costello*, 198 F.2d 200, 205 (2d Cir. 1952); *see also United States v. Brewster*, 154 F.Supp. 126, 134 (D.D.C. 1957) (finding a witness guilty of Contempt of Congress because “a witness has no right to set his own conditions for testifying”).

<sup>8</sup> *United States v. Hintz*, 193 F.Supp. 325, 335 (N.D. Ill. 1961).

<sup>9</sup> Letter from David E. Kendall to James Comer, *supra* note 1 at p. 2 (emphasis added).

In sum, your arguments lack merit and completely ignore the lengthy rationales provided in the Committee's October 22, 2025 letter.<sup>10</sup> Accordingly, pursuant to the Committee's August 5, 2025 subpoenas,<sup>11</sup> depositions of President Clinton and Secretary Clinton are scheduled for the following dates:

- President Clinton – December 17, 2025, at 10:00 a.m. in Washington, D.C.
- Secretary Clinton – December 18, 2025, at 10:00 a.m. in Washington, D.C.

The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is the principal oversight committee of the U.S. House of Representatives and has broad authority to investigate “any matter” at “any time” under House Rule X.<sup>12</sup> If you have any questions, please contact Committee on Oversight and Government Reform Majority staff at (202) 225-5074.

Sincerely,



---

James Comer  
Chairman  
Committee on Oversight and Government Reform

cc: The Honorable Robert Garcia, Ranking Member  
Committee on Oversight and Government Reform

---

<sup>10</sup> Letter from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform to David E. Kendall (Oct. 22, 2025).

<sup>11</sup> Letter and subpoena from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight & Gov't Reform, to Hillary R. Clinton (Aug. 5, 2025); Letter and subpoena from James Comer, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight & Gov't Reform, to William J. Clinton (Aug. 5, 2025).

<sup>12</sup> Rule X, cl. 4(c)(2), Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, 119th Cong. (Jan. 16, 2025).