

**United States Senate Committee on Finance**

**June 3, 2025**

**Hearing to Consider the nominations of Joseph Barloon, of Maryland, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative (Geneva Office), with the rank of Ambassador, vice Maria Pagan, resigned; Janet Dhillon, of Virginia, to be Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation for a term of five years, vice Gordon Hartogensis, term expired; and Brian Morrissey, Jr., of Virginia, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury, vice Neil Harvey MacBride.**

**Question for the Record submitted to Brian Morrissey, Jr. from Senator Tim Scott.**

Question 1: Mr. Morrissey, in your private practice and previous government service, you've advised clients on navigating and challenging burdensome federal regulations.

Given Treasury's expansive role in financial oversight, how do you see the Office of General Counsel balancing the need for regulatory enforcement with the importance of maintaining a predictable, restrained legal environment that encourages innovation and investment?

*As I noted in my hearing, the role of the Treasury Legal Division is to ensure that the actions Treasury takes to achieve its statutory mission are lawful, durable, and clear. While the Legal Division does not set policy, the Legal Division is responsible for working closely with Treasury's policy components to ensure that Treasury regulations adhere to the law. As Secretary Bessent has stated, the guiding principles to sound and lawful regulation include ensuring that the regulation has a clear statutory mandate, appropriately balances costs and benefits, and is fair—i.e., that the rules are clearly stated and consistently applied. If confirmed, I pledge to work with Treasury's policy team from start to finish to ensure that Treasury rulemakings are consistent with these principles and with the law.*

**Question for the Record submitted to Brian Morrissey, Jr. from Senator Thom Tillis.**

Question 1: On March 26, 2025, FinCEN issued an interim final rule that removes all requirements for U.S. companies and U.S. individuals to report beneficial ownership information (BOI) under the Corporate Transparency Act (CTA).

*Will you commit to deleting BOI of U.S. companies and individuals that are no longer required to file BOI, but have already done so?*

*As I noted in my hearing, illicit finance can foster a range of criminal activities that threaten our national security, including drug trafficking, money laundering, and human trafficking. In my view, when the Department considers regulating in this space, it is imperative to work to make sure law enforcement can obtain the information it needs, and to regulate in a responsible way that does not impose undue burdens on law abiding taxpayers. If confirmed,*

*I pledge to work with FinCEN to finalize the interim final rule in a manner that is consistent with these principles and with the law.*

*As I noted in the hearing, if confirmed, I pledge to work with Treasury's components, including FinCEN, to ensure that any taxpayer or other sensitive information held by the Department is stored, maintained and, where appropriate, disposed of, in a safe and sound manner consistent with applicable laws.*

**Questions for the Record submitted to Brian Morrissey Jr. from Ranking Member Wyden.**

**Question 1:**

- The administration has been breaking the law left and right. President Trump has been publicly asking the IRS to audit his enemies like Harvard, and to stop auditing his friends like MyPillow CEO Mike Lindell. And Treasury officials have reportedly asked the IRS to follow through on those requests. That's plainly illegal under 26 USC section 7217. You're going to need to get familiar with that section in this administration.
- DOGE has been stomping all over taxpayer privacy. The Center for Taxpayer Rights and others have sued the administration, arguing it broke the law by allowing DOGE and DHS to access tax return information. At risk was the most private personal and financial data of virtually everybody in America. Home addresses, bank accounts, income levels, Social Security numbers, and much more. The Acting IRS Commissioner and Chief Privacy Officer resigned or were pushed out over this.
- Twenty State Attorneys General and others argued the administration illegally fired probationary employees and then lied to cover it up by saying they were fired for poor performance. Two district courts agreed and temporarily ordered the employees to be rehired.
- I've asked you this question several times, but you have yet to provide a straight answer. **If confirmed, will you resign if you cannot prevent the administration from continuing to break the law?**

*If confirmed, I am committed to following the law and working diligently with Treasury's policy teams to ensure that the Department is achieving its statutory mission in accordance with law, including privacy and personnel laws, as applicable. Further, as I noted during the hearing, partisan and personal considerations have no place in the enforcement of the law. If confirmed, my legal advice will honor that fundamental principle, which is what President Trump and Secretary Bessent expect from the Legal Division.*

**Question 2:**

- I'm a big believer in transparency, but this administration issued an executive order requiring agencies to repeal ten pieces of guidance for every new one.

- That makes it nearly impossible for any government agency to do the job of letting the public know what the rules are.
- **If confirmed, how will you work around this to ensure the public knows what the rules are?**

*Transparency is a critically important value in rulemaking. As Secretary Bessent has stated, sound regulation must be fair—i.e., the rules of the road must be clearly stated and consistently applied. If confirmed, I commit to working diligently with Treasury’s policy components to ensure that Treasury’s regulations are consistent with this principle and with all applicable legal requirements.*

### **Question 3:**

- Like nearly every other member of Congress on both sides of the aisle, I’m a big fan of the IRS’s Taxpayer Advocate Service (TAS) and the National Taxpayer Advocate (NTA) who leads that office. TAS helps constituents who are facing problems with the IRS. For the first time in 2015, NTA’s request to backfill attorney positions was suddenly denied. IRS Counsel cited a new interpretation of an old Treasury Order.
- Legislation, which passed the House, would clarify the NTA’s authority to hire attorneys, but the General Counsel of the Treasury has the authority to allow the NTA to hire attorneys without legislation.
- **If confirmed, will you review this order and do what you can to ensure the NTA can hire the attorneys she needs to continue her important work for Congress?**

*If confirmed, I commit to reviewing the law on this issue and working, as appropriate, with the IRS and members of Congress and the Administration to ensure the TAS fulfills its statutory mandate.*

### **Question 4:**

I understand that the Secretary of the Treasury is leading the Administration’s trade negotiations with certain key trading partners, such as Japan. Congress has long recognized that meaningful consultations with Congress and stakeholders are essential and, consequently, has codified certain transparency and consultation requirements with respect to the negotiation of trade agreements. Notwithstanding the Secretary’s primary role in the current negotiations, the Treasury Department has not responded to requests from Finance Committee staff to brief on the status of the trade negotiations. I am concerned that this lack of transparency undermines Congress’s ability to provide meaningful feedback on developing trade negotiations. As General Counsel at Treasury, you will advise Treasury policymakers on Treasury’s legal authorities and obligations with respect to the negotiation of international agreements. **If confirmed, will you commit to ensuring that Treasury provides regular, substantive updates to Congress on all trade negotiations for which the Secretary is leading the Administration’s negotiating efforts?**

***I understand that Secretary Bessent has made it clear in his public statements that in every situation, President Trump is leading the Administration's trade negotiations with its counterparts.***

***If confirmed, I commit to working closely with Treasury policymakers to ensure that the Department's actions in international negotiations are consistent with the law.***

**Question 5:**

This administration has been snooping on taxpayer's return information for purposes other than tax administration. That's generally not allowed. Two district courts issued preliminary injunctions to bar DOGE or DHS from accessing Treasury Department payment systems and tax information, and some of those suits are still pending. You are going to need to be watching this administration like a hawk to prevent it from breaking the law. **If confirmed, will you commit to ensuring that any tax return information that the IRS or Treasury maintains is used solely for tax administration absent express authorization under code section 6103? If your answer is no, please explain your answer.**

***The protection of tax returns and tax return information is essential to maintaining taxpayers' confidence in the IRS and the federal government more generally. If confirmed, I will be committed to upholding taxpayer privacy rights and to working appropriately with the IRS to ensure adherence to the statutory protections found in the tax code.***

**Question for the Record submitted to Brian Morrissey, Jr. from Senator Warren.**

Question 1: Please explain, in your own words, whether you believe it is legal or illegal for the President to request you or any other Treasury or IRS official to conduct or terminate an audit or other investigation of any particular taxpayer.

***The professionalism and non-partisanship of the IRS is essential to maintaining taxpayers' confidence in the IRS and the federal government more generally. If confirmed, I will support the fair and impartial implementation of our nation's tax laws, including the important safeguards against improper interference with taxpayer audits and investigations.***

Question 2: Please explain, in your own words, whether you believe it is legal or illegal for the President to request you or any other Treasury or IRS official to revoke the non-profit status of any particular taxpayer.

***The professionalism and non-partisanship of the IRS is essential to maintaining taxpayers' confidence in the IRS and the federal government more generally. If confirmed, I will support the fair and impartial implementation of our nation's tax laws, including the important safeguards against improper interference with taxpayer audits and investigations.***

Question 4: Do you pledge to advise Treasury and IRS officials to never follow the direction of the President or anyone else outside the formal exam team to initiate or change an audit or investigate any person or entity on the basis of their political beliefs, financial interests, hiring or

organizational practices, or personal interests, and to report to the Senate Finance Committee if you receive such a direction?

***The professionalism and non-partisanship of the IRS is essential to maintaining taxpayers' confidence in the IRS and the federal government more generally. If confirmed, I will support the fair and impartial implementation of our nation's tax laws, including the important safeguards against improper interference with taxpayer audits and investigations.***

***Further, as I noted during the hearing, partisan and personal considerations have no place in the enforcement of the law. If confirmed, my legal advice will honor that fundamental principle, which is what President Trump and Secretary Bessent expect from the Legal Division.***

Question 5: Do you pledge to advise Treasury and IRS officials to never allow the President or employees of the Executive Office of the President to direct or influence the audit or termination of an audit or investigation of any individual or entity?

***If confirmed, I will follow the law and provide legal advice consistent with the principles articulated in my response to your Question 4 above.***

Question 6: Do you pledge to advise Treasury and IRS officials to never allow a political appointee of the President, or allies or business associates of the President, to direct or influence the audit or termination of an audit or investigation of any individual or entity?

***If confirmed, I will follow the law and provide legal advice consistent with the principles articulated in my response to your Question 4 above.***

Question 7: Do you pledge to advise Treasury and IRS officials to never allow political appointees at Treasury or the IRS to direct or influence the audit or termination of an audit or investigation of any individual or entity?

***If confirmed, I will follow the law and provide legal advice consistent with the principles articulated in my response to your Question 4 above.***

Question 8: If the President indicates that he would like you or any other Treasury or IRS official to revoke or otherwise modify the tax-exempt status of Harvard University or any other organization for any other reason, will you comply or advise those officials concerned to comply?

***If confirmed, I will follow the law and provide legal advice consistent with the principles articulated in my response to Question 4 above.***

***The professionalism and non-partisanship of the IRS is essential to maintaining taxpayers' confidence in the IRS and the federal government more generally. If confirmed, I will support the fair and impartial implementation of our nation's tax laws, including the important safeguards against improper interference with taxpayer audits and investigations.***

***Further, as I noted during the hearing, partisan and personal considerations have no place in the enforcement of the law. If confirmed, my legal advice will honor that fundamental principle, which is what President Trump and Secretary Bessent expect from the Legal Division.***

Question 9: Under section 7212 of the Internal Revenue Code, it is unlawful to impede an IRS employee from acting to enforce the Code.

- A. Do you commit to following this statutory requirement?
- B. If confirmed, what would you do if the President, White House employees, political appointees, family members, friends, confidants, and business associates of the President asked you to push for a particular result on a taxpayer's audit?
- C. What would you do if the President, White House employees, political appointees, family members, friends, confidants, or business associates of the President started posting online the names and addresses of IRS employees alongside criticism of their work?

***If confirmed, I will follow the law and provide legal advice consistent with the principles articulated in my response to your Question 4 above.***

Question 10: To help pay for tax cuts for the ultra-wealthy, President Trump's 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act (TCJA) made some efforts to close tax loopholes that incentivize U.S. companies to offshore their manufacturing enterprises. However, the business world reacted immediately, lobbying aggressively to undermine these reforms. Following a lobbying blitz led by big corporations after the enactment of the TCJA under President Trump, the Treasury Department and IRS used their regulatory power to carve out exceptions and giveaways for the rich. What is your plan to ensure that the previous regulatory giveaway is not repeated? Will you work to reverse previous rulemaking that led to exceptions and giveaways for the rich?

***If confirmed, my role as General Counsel will not be to set policy, but to work with Treasury's policy components to ensure that Treasury's actions to achieve its statutory mission are consistent with law. As Secretary Bessent has stated, the guiding principles to sound and lawful regulation include ensuring that the regulation has a clear statutory mandate, appropriately balances costs and benefits, and is fair—i.e., the rules must be clearly stated and consistently applied. If confirmed, I will work diligently with the appropriate policy teams to ensure that tax regulations are consistent with these principles and consistent with the law.***

Question 11: The Standard Industry Fare Level (SIFL) valuation method allows executives who report the personal use of corporate jets to significantly downplay the value of the flights on their tax returns, resulting in a reduction of their tax bill. If confirmed, would you exercise Treasury's authority to revisit these income inclusion regulations to more accurately reflect the benefit that executives receive?

***I am not familiar with the SIFL issue specifically, but I understand that the use of proper valuation methods is important to ensuring the law is being applied appropriately. I commit to following the law on these issues.***

Question 12: Tax preparation companies have egregiously—and illegally—misused sensitive and private taxpayer data, sharing it with big tech companies without obtaining

permission. Would you recommend that the Department of Justice (DOJ) prosecute tax preparation companies that have disclosed tax preparation data for unrelated purposes, such as advertising, without consumer consent?

***I am not familiar with the allegations described here and would not pre-judge such a matter. Criminal prosecutions are the responsibility of the Department of Justice, and if confirmed, I would cooperate with the Department of Justice and other law enforcement agencies as appropriate.***

Question 13: Do you support DOGE's efforts at the IRS to date, including DOGE's mass firings and access to Americans' sensitive data?

***As I noted during the hearing, as good stewards of taxpayer funds, it is important for Treasury and IRS to make diligent efforts to modernize the IRS in order to improve collections and improve customer service. It is also important to ensure that any such efforts adhere to all applicable laws, including taxpayer privacy and personnel laws. If confirmed, I look forward to working closely with Treasury and IRS policymakers to ensure that the IRS fulfills its statutory responsibilities and offers world-class customer service for the American people.***

Question 14: Have you been in touch with any of the DOGE team members who are tasked with working with the IRS? If yes, please list each conversation you have had and the substance of each conversation.

***No.***

Question 15: Do you plan to allow DOGE team members access to tax returns, or tax return information at the IRS that is protected by Sections 6103 and 7213A of the tax code?

- A. If you plan to allow access to this heavily-protected information, please describe the type of return information that the DOGE team members may access and the specific reason why each DOGE team member should be granted the authority to inspect tax return information.
- B. Please also describe what steps you will take to ensure compliance with Sections 6103 and 7213A of the tax code.
- C. Do you pledge to refuse any request to improperly disclose taxpayer information?

***The protection of tax returns and tax return information is essential to maintaining taxpayers' confidence in the IRS and the federal government more generally. If confirmed, I am committed to working closely with Treasury and IRS policymakers to ensure that all statutory safeguards for taxpayer information are upheld, including in connection with the IRS's important ongoing efforts to modernize its infrastructure and systems to deliver better collections, enhance privacy, and improve customer service.***

Question 16: A former IRS Commissioner has stated that they and other political appointees did not have direct access to particular taxpayers' information, and they would have no reason

to. Do you agree that you and other political appointees at Treasury and the IRS should not have access to particular taxpayers' information?

- A. Would you commit to informing this full Committee if you or any other political appointee is directly given access to particular taxpayers' information and explain the administrative reason why the access was given?

***If confirmed, I will follow the law and provide legal advice consistent with the principles articulated in my response to Question 4 above.***

Question 17: DOGE has reportedly held a "hackathon" in order to create a "mega API," or Application Programming Interface, for accessing Internal Revenue Service data. The API would be used to move the data into a cloud platform—potentially a third-party one—to serve as the "read center" of the agency's systems. A "mega-API" that draws data from every IRS system would destroy the compartmentalization that protects taxpayer data, putting private details of Americans' lives at an unacceptable risk of disclosure. A person with access to the "mega-API" could export tax returns and return information that the IRS is required to keep confidential.

- A. Do you support the creation of this "mega-API"?
- B. If so, what are your plans to ensure that taxpayer information contained in this "mega-API" remains confidential?

***I am not familiar with such reports and have not been briefed on any such matter, as I am not presently at the Department. If confirmed, I am committed to working closely with Treasury and IRS policymakers to ensure that all statutory safeguards for taxpayer information are upheld, including in connection with the IRS's important ongoing efforts to modernize its infrastructure and systems to deliver better collections, enhance privacy, and improve customer service.***

Question 18: The IRS has entered into a memorandum of understanding with the Department of Homeland Security to turn over information about undocumented immigrants to DHS, allowing DHS to use IRS records to verify names and addresses of persons DHS intends to take action against.

- A. Do you think that entering into this memorandum of understanding was the right choice?
- B. Do you think that this memorandum of understanding is legal?

***If confirmed, I am committed to working with the appropriate teams at Treasury and IRS to ensure that any law enforcement request for taxpayer information is appropriately responded to in a manner consistent with the Department's legal obligations to its law enforcement partners and consistent with the statutory safeguards Congress has established for taxpayer information.***

***I am not at the Department and therefore do not have the benefit of all the facts and legal analysis that informed this memorandum of understanding between Treasury and DHS. I also understand that the matter is the subject of litigation, and that a federal district judge determined that the memorandum of understanding was consistent with the Internal Revenue Code. If confirmed, I commit to reviewing this matter and to following the law.***



Question 19: The Trump Administration has attacked federal workers and the unions that represent them, even trying to strip the rights of many government employees to join a union. Will you commit to upholding existing collective bargaining agreements and bargaining in good faith in any negotiations?

***If confirmed, I will follow the law, including applicable personnel laws.***

Question 20: As General Counsel, you and your team may be asked to review remarks prepared for Treasury leadership. If you were reviewing remarks for Secretary Bessent that contained nonpublic, potentially market-moving information on the President's tariff policy—and he was set to give those remarks to a small group of Wall Street executives just hours before the policy would be announced publicly—would you advise him against that? If yes, please explain why.

***If confirmed, when called upon to review public statements or remarks, I commit to working with the appropriate Treasury policy office and the Office of Public Affairs to understand the facts and ensure that public statements or remarks appropriately account for any Department legal or ethical obligations that may apply to the information being discussed.***

**Question for the Record submitted to Brian Morrissey, Jr. from Senator Warnock.**

Question 1: On May 22, 2025, the Government Accountability Office found that the Department of Transportation violated the Impoundment Control Act in failing to obligate funding for the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Formula Program.<sup>1</sup> Do you believe the Impoundment Control Act is constitutional?

***I am not familiar with this GAO matter. If confirmed, I would defer to counsel for the Department of Transportation on matters relating to the Department of Transportation's implementation of its statutory responsibilities.***

Question 2: Will you advise agency officials to obey the Impoundment Control Act?

***If confirmed, I will advise Treasury Department officials to follow the law on appropriations and all other matters.***

Question 3: Do you believe that the President has the authority to permanently cancel federal spending outside the procedures described under the Impoundment Control Act?

***The President and the Office of Management and Budget are responsible for making decisions regarding the President's authorities related to impoundment. If confirmed, I will advise Treasury Department officials to follow the law on appropriations and all other matters.***

---

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Department of Transportation, *Federal Highway Administration—Application of the Impoundment Control Act to Memorandum Suspending Approval of State Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Deployment Plans*, GAO B-337137, U.S. Government Accountability Office (May 22, 2025), <https://www.gao.gov/products/b-337137>.

Question 4: The Department of Homeland Security has reached a data-sharing deal with the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) for use by Immigration and Customs Enforcement. Do you agree that taxpayer data can only be shared with other federal agencies and contractors if authorized by Section 6103 and related statutes?

***If confirmed, I am committed to working with the appropriate teams at Treasury and IRS to ensure that any law enforcement request for taxpayer information is appropriately responded to in a manner consistent with the Department's legal obligations to its law enforcement partners and consistent with the statutory safeguards Congress has established for taxpayer information.***

***I am not at the Department and therefore do not have the benefit of all the facts and legal analysis that informed this memorandum of understanding between Treasury and DHS. I also understand that the matter is the subject of litigation, and that a federal district judge determined that the memorandum of understanding was consistent with the Internal Revenue Code. If confirmed, I commit to reviewing this matter and to following the law.***

Question 5: Would you advise Treasury officials to share taxpayer data with unauthorized agencies?

***If confirmed, I am committed to working with the appropriate teams at Treasury and IRS to ensure that any law enforcement request for taxpayer information is appropriately responded to in a manner consistent with the Department's legal obligations to its law enforcement partners and consistent with the statutory safeguards Congress has established for taxpayer information.***

Question 6: The Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) is reportedly creating a platform through which “anyone with access could view and possibly manipulate all IRS data in one place.”<sup>2</sup> Do you agree that federal law does not authorize the IRS to share tax data with DOGE or federal agencies absent specific purposes and justifications?

***I am not familiar with such reports and have not been briefed on any such matter, as I am not presently at the Department. If confirmed, I am committed to working closely with Treasury and IRS policymakers to ensure that all statutory safeguards for taxpayer information are upheld, including in connection with the IRS's important ongoing efforts to modernize its infrastructure and systems to deliver better collections, enhance privacy, and improve customer service.***

Question 7: If confirmed, how will you do to ensure that the IRS audit selection process is fair and unbiased?

***The professionalism and non-partisanship of the IRS is essential to maintaining taxpayers' confidence in the IRS and the federal government more generally. If confirmed, I will support***

---

<sup>2</sup> Makena Kelly, *DOGE Is Planning a Hackathon at the IRS. It Wants Easier Access to Taxpayer Data*, Wired (Apr. 5, 2025), <https://www.wired.com/story/doge-hackathon-irs-data-palantir>.

***the fair and impartial implementation of our nation's tax laws, including the laws related to IRS audits.***

Question 8: Would measures such as releasing audit rates by zip code help increase transparency and public trust, and would you work with me to develop such measures?

***Transparency is a critically important value in rulemaking and enforcement. If confirmed, I commit to working with IRS and Treasury officials and members of this Committee, as appropriate, to ensure that any future measures under consideration comply with the law.***

Question 9: Do you believe that an IRS Commissioner should recuse themselves from matters involving large and recent campaign donors, particularly those who donated following the announcement of their nomination to be IRS Commissioner? Would such recusals help support the public perception of fairness and impartiality at the IRS?

***I believe all Treasury personnel should consult with the Treasury Legal Division's dedicated and expert ethics team to ensure adherence to their ethical obligations. If confirmed, I commit to working with Treasury's ethics team to ensure Treasury personnel have access to appropriate advice to enable them to fulfill their statutory responsibilities in a manner consistent with applicable ethics requirements.***

Question 10: Do you believe that all Treasury officials should have to recuse themselves from matters that might benefit their personal financial interests?

***I believe all Treasury personnel should consult with the Treasury Legal Division's dedicated and expert ethics team to ensure adherence to their ethical obligations. If confirmed, I commit to working with Treasury's ethics team to ensure Treasury personnel have access to appropriate advice to enable them to fulfill their statutory responsibilities in a manner consistent with applicable ethics requirements.***

Question 11: If confirmed, do you pledge to report a directive by President Trump or someone in the Administration to initiate or terminate an audit to the Treasury Inspector General and to advise Treasury employees to do the same?

***The professionalism and non-partisanship of the IRS is essential to maintaining taxpayers' confidence in the IRS and the federal government more generally. If confirmed, I will support the fair and impartial implementation of our nation's tax laws, including the important safeguards against improper interference with taxpayer audits and investigations.***

***Further, as I noted during the hearing, partisan and personal considerations have no place in the enforcement of the law. If confirmed, my legal advice will honor that fundamental principle, which is what President Trump and Secretary Bessent expect from the Legal Division.***

Question 12: If confirmed, do you pledge to report a directive by President Trump or someone in the Administration to initiate or terminate an audit to the Chair and Ranking Member of the Senate Finance Committee and to advise Treasury employees to do the same?

***If confirmed, I will follow the law and provide legal advice consistent with the principles articulated in my response to your Question 11 above.***

Question 13: Do you believe that a public statement by a president or Administration official calling for the initiation or termination of an audit constitutes a directive to the IRS?

***If confirmed, I will follow the law and provide legal advice consistent with the principles articulated in my response to your Question 11 above.***

Question 14: Should Treasury or IRS employees attach any weight or consideration to public statements by Administration officials that call for the initiation or termination of an audit?

***If confirmed, I will follow the law and provide legal advice consistent with the principles articulated in my response to your Question 11 above.***

Question 15: How will you ensure that no political appointee, or other associates of the President, directs or influences an audit of any taxpayer? Do you commit to adhering to protocols that investigations into specific taxpayers should only be initiated and overseen by civil service professionals at the IRS?

***If confirmed, I will follow the law and provide legal advice consistent with the principles articulated in my response to your Question 11 above.***

Question 16: Will you commit to, within 30 days of your confirmation, investigating and reporting back to this full Committee any requests made during this Administration before your confirmation from the President, any political appointee, any ally or business associate of the President, or any family member of the President to direct or influence the audit or termination of an audit or investigation of any individual or entity?

***If confirmed, I will follow the law and provide legal advice consistent with the principles articulated in my response to your Question 11 above.***