Dear Ranking Member Nunes:

The Committee is in receipt of your letter, dated today, proposing witnesses for the impeachment inquiry’s open hearings. The Committee is carefully evaluating the witness list you provided, along with the written justifications you included.

Consistent with H. Res. 660 and as noted in my November 6, 2019 letter, the Committee will give due consideration to witnesses within the scope of the impeachment inquiry.¹

In doing so, the Committee is mindful that this inquiry is a solemn undertaking, enshrined by the Founders in the Constitution, to determine whether the President of the United States warrants impeachment by the House of Representatives.

As we move to open hearings, it is important to underscore that the impeachment inquiry, and the Committee, will not serve as vehicles for any Member to carry out the same sham investigations into the Bidens or debunked conspiracies about 2016 U.S. election interference that President Trump pressed Ukraine to conduct for his personal political benefit.

The Committee also will not facilitate efforts by President Trump and his allies in Congress to threaten, intimidate, and retaliate against the whistleblower who courageously raised the initial alarm. It remains the duty of the Intelligence Committee to protect whistleblowers, and until recently, this was a bipartisan priority.² The whistleblower has a right under laws championed by this Committee to remain anonymous and to be protected from harm.

¹ See generally H. Res. 660 (Oct. 31, 2019) § 2(1), (3). See also H. Rept. 116-266 (Oct. 30, 2019) at 2; Letter from Chairman Adam B. Schiff to Ranking Member Devin Nunes, November 6, 2019.

² See e.g., Press Conference, Chairman Devin Nunes, March 24, 2017. ("As you know, and I’ve said this several times, we don’t talk about sources at this committee. We want more people to come forward. The good thing
The impeachment inquiry, moreover, has gathered an ever-growing body of evidence—from witnesses and documents, including the President’s own words in his July 25 call record—that not only confirms, but far exceeds, the initial information in the whistleblower’s complaint. The whistleblower’s testimony is therefore redundant and unnecessary. In light of the President’s threats, the individual’s appearance before us would only place their personal safety at grave risk.

Sincerely,

Adam B. Schiff
Chairman