

Elston, Michael (ODAG)

From: Scott-Finan, Nancy
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2007 6:26 PM
To: Hertling, Richard; Burton, Faith; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Möschella, William; Margolis, David; Sampson, Kyle; Goodling, Monica; Battle, Michael (USAEO); Nowacki, John (USAEO); Macklin, Jay (USAEO); Scolinos, Tasia; Roehrkasse, Brian
Cc: Seidel, Rebecca; Tracci, Robert N
Subject: FW: HJC USA Briefing and Hearing Invitation

Attachments: HJC Hearing Invitation USA.pdf; HJC Briefing Request re USAs.pdf

Attached is the hearing invitation letter for the March 6 HJC hearing on "Restoring Checks and Balances in the Confirmation Process of U.S. Attorneys." Please note that they specifically request Paul and do not indicate that this is a Subcommittee hearing. The second letter is the briefing request and request for the EARS reports--please note that they ask for the EARS reports for all US Attorneys who have resigned since March 9, 2006--we have had 16 vacancies since March 9th.

From: Cabral, Catalina
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2007 6:16 PM
To: Scott-Finan, Nancy; Clifton, Deborah J
Subject: HJC USA Briefing and Hearing Invitation

Debbie,
The first document is a hearing invitation.


HJC Hearing
Invitation USA.pdf...


HJC Briefing
Request re USAs.p...

Catalina Cabral
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Office of Legislative Affairs
Catalina.Cabral@USDOJ.gov
(202) 514-4828

Elston, Michael (ODAG)

From: Moschella, William
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2007 7:47 PM
To: Scott-Finan, Nancy; Hertling, Richard; Burton, Faith; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Margolis, David; Sampson, Kyle; Goodling, Monica; Battle, Michael (USAEO); Nowacki, John (USAEO); Macklin, Jay (USAEO); Scolinos, Tasia; Roehrkasse, Brian
Cc: Seidel, Rebecca; Tracci, Robert N
Subject: RE: HJC USA Briefing and Hearing Invitation

The testimony needs to be updated to address hr 580.

From: Scott-Finan, Nancy
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2007 6:26 PM
To: Hertling, Richard; Burton, Faith; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Moschella, William; Margolis, David; Sampson, Kyle; Goodling, Monica; Battle, Michael (USAEO); Nowacki, John (USAEO); Macklin, Jay (USAEO); Scolinos, Tasia; Roehrkasse, Brian
Cc: Seidel, Rebecca; Tracci, Robert N
Subject: FW: HJC USA Briefing and Hearing Invitation

Attached is the hearing invitation letter for the March 6 HJC hearing on "Restoring Checks and Balances in the Confirmation Process of U.S. Attorneys." Please note that they specifically request Paul and do not indicate that this is a Subcommittee hearing. The second letter is the briefing request and request for the EARS reports--please note that they ask for the EARS reports for all US Attorneys who have resigned since March 9, 2006--we have had 16 vacancies since March 9th.

From: Cabral, Catalina
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2007 6:16 PM
To: Scott-Finan, Nancy; Clifton, Deborah J
Subject: HJC USA Briefing and Hearing Invitation

Debbie,
The first document is a hearing invitation.

<< File: HJC Hearing Invitation USA.pdf >> << File: HJC Briefing Request re USAs.pdf >>

Catalina Cabral
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Office of Legislative Affairs
Catalina.Cabral@USDOJ.gov
(202) 514-4828

Elston, Michael (ODAG)

From: Goodling, Monica
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2007 8:23 PM
To: Elston, Michael (ODAG); Moschella, William; Sampson, Kyle
Subject: FW: Farewell, Adios, Good bye, Auf Weidersehen

FYI - mass email today.

From: Iglesias, David C. (USANM) [mailto:David.C.Iglesias@usdoj.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2007 8:01 PM
To: USAEO-USAttorneys
Subject: Farewell, Adios, Good bye, Auf Weidersehen

Dear friends and colleagues:

As King Solomon wrote more than 2,500 years ago, "there is a time for everything." It's time to say goodbye from this wonderful job. Tomorrow will be my last day as U.S. Attorney. It's been the most responsible job I've ever had and the second most exciting job I've ever had (nothing beats being launched off and landing on a Navy aircraft carrier). The years have been an unprecedented mixture of experiences, memories and accomplishments. Beyond the record number of criminal cases my AUSAs brought, I'm proud of my hard-working office and its 95% conviction rate. I'm proud to have successfully prosecuted the biggest political corruption case in New Mexico history. I'm proud of having nationally recognized Weed and Seed and PSN programs. But, it's more than just metrics, it's about forming friendships with many of you. I'll never forget going to Colombia and Mexico with Johnny Sutton, Paul Charlton and the late great Mike Shelby. I'll never forget visiting drug cartel lord Pablo Escobar's home in Medellin and realizing America saved Colombia from becoming the world's first "narcocracy." I'll never forget running in L.A.'s seedy MacArthur Park with Matt Whitaker in the early morning hours. I'll never forget speaking at Main Justice's Great Hall for Hispanic Heritage Month, or testifying before Congress, debating a member of Congress and Village Voice journalist on the Patriot Act, backseating an F-16, or getting an op-ed published on immigration reform in the Washington Times. I'll never forget former A.G. and Mrs. John Ashcroft giving us a walking tour of the Washington monuments at night. Heady stuff for a guy originally from Panama whose family is just one generation removed from subsistence living in the jungle.

As one of just several US Attorneys born outside the United States, I know the America dream lives. I'd like to thank President Bush for nominating me to be the United States Attorney almost 6 years ago. I am grateful to have been allowed the honor of making a difference in my community. We need US Attorneys who "maintain justice and do what is right" (Isaiah 56:1) and are willing to pay the price for doing so.

After taking off the month of March to decompress and performing Navy duty overseas in April, I will begin my new job. I haven't decided which of my options to pursue, but in the interim you can reach me at [redacted]. I wish you all success in the next 22 months in keeping America safe against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

Respectfully,

David

Elston, Michael (ODAG)

From: Hertling, Richard
Sent: Wednesday, February 28, 2007 5:29 PM
To: Nowacki, John (USAEO); Sampson, Kyle; Goodling, Monica; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG)
Subject: RE: house subpoena
Attachments: spacer.gif; spacer.gif; logo_us_canadian_2.gif; spacer.gif; hline_purple.gif; spacer.gif; spacer.gif

 spacer.gif (133 B)  spacer.gif (133 B)  logo_us_canadian_2.gif (2 KB)  spacer.gif (133 B)  hline_purple.gif (290 B)  spacer.gif (133 B)  spacer.gif (133 B)

The others to be subpoenaed are Lam, McKay, and Iglesias.

thanks.

From: Nowacki, John (USAEO) [mailto:John.Nowacki@usdoj.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 28, 2007 5:27 PM
To: Sampson, Kyle; Goodling, Monica; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard
Subject: FW: house subpoena

FYI -- From Bud Cummins.

From: Battle, Michael (USAEO)
Sent: Wednesday, February 28, 2007 5:04 PM
To: Nowacki, John (USAEO)
Subject: FW: house subpoena

FYI.

From: Bud Cummins [mailto:bud.cummins@aael.net]
Sent: Wednesday, February 28, 2007 4:50 PM
To: Battle, Michael (USAEO)
Subject: house subpoena

Mike,

FYI, house committee called today saying they intend to subpoena me and others (I didn't ask who) for next Tuesday, March 6. If I have any legal obligations to run this somehow through DOJ please let me know. If someone at DOJ wants to talk before the testimony, I am available to do that also.

Best regards,

Bud

Bud Cummins
Consultant

Fueling Our Future

www.uscbiofuels.net

US Canadian BioFuels Inc
divider
divider

Disclaimer This message (including any attachments) may contain confidential information. The information is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the addressee or the employee or agent responsible to deliver this email to its intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, use, dissemination, distribution, disclosure, copying or taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

Elston, Michael (ODAG)

From: Elston, Michael (ODAG)
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2007 8:07 PM
To: Scott-Finan, Nancy; Hertling, Richard; Burton, Faith; Moschella, William; Margolis, David; Sampson, Kyle; Goodling, Monica; Battle, Michael (USAEO); Nowacki, John (USAEO); Macklin, Jay (USAEO); Scolinos, Tasia; Roehrkasse, Brian
Cc: Seidel, Rebecca; Tracci, Robert N
Subject: Re: HJC USA Briefing and Hearing Invitation

They'll have to be satisfied with Will -- Will says he is more photogenic anyway.

-----Original Message-----

From: Scott-Finan, Nancy
To: Hertling, Richard; Burton, Faith; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Moschella, William; Margolis, David; Sampson, Kyle; Goodling, Monica; Battle, Michael (USAEO); Nowacki, John (USAEO); Macklin, Jay (USAEO); Scolinos, Tasia; Roehrkasse, Brian
CC: Seidel, Rebecca; Tracci, Robert N
Sent: Mon Feb 26 18:25:44 2007
Subject: FW: HJC USA Briefing and Hearing Invitation

Attached is the hearing invitation letter for the March 6 HJC hearing on "Restoring Checks and Balances in the Confirmation Process of U.S. Attorneys." Please note that they specifically request Paul and do not indicate that this is a Subcommittee hearing. The second letter is the briefing request and request for the EARS reports---please note that they ask for the EARS reports for all US Attorneys who have resigned since March 9, 2006-- we have had 16 vacancies since March 9th.

From: Cabral, Catalina
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2007 6:16 PM
To: Scott-Finan, Nancy; Clifton, Deborah J
Subject: HJC USA Briefing and Hearing Invitation

Debbie,

The first document is a hearing invitation.

<<HJC Hearing Invitation USA.pdf>>

<<HJC Briefing Request re USAs.pdf>>

Catalina Cabral
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Office of Legislative Affairs
Catalina.Cabral@USDOJ.gov
(202) 514-4828

Elston, Michael (ODAG)

From: Goodling, Monica
Sent: Saturday, March 03, 2007 3:31 PM
To: Sampson, Kyle; Moschella, William; Scolinos, Tasia; Roehrkasse, Brian; Hertling, Richard; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Scott-Finan, Nancy; Seidel, Rebecca
Subject: Updated USA documents - PUBLIC

Attachments: TPS - US Attorney vacancy-appointment points.pdf; FACT SHEET - USA appointments.pdf; Examples of Difficult Transition Situations.pdf; USA prosecution only stats.pdf; WHY 120 DAYS IS NOT REALISTIC.doc; Griffin Talkers.doc; Griffin resume.doc

Attached please find updated documents in advance of this week's hearing. (These include the resignations in Nevada and New Mexico, where we elevated the First Assistant to the position of Acting U.S. Attorney under the Vacancy Reform Act; no additional resignations are expected before mid-March, when Chiara departs.) Please let me know if you have any questions. Thanks!

						
TPS - US Attorney vacancy-appe...	FACT SHEET - USA appointments....	Examples of Difficult Transiti...	USA prosecution only stats.pdf...	WHY 120 DAYS IS NOT REALISTIC....	Griffin Talkers.doc (33 KB)	Griffin resume.doc (89 KB)

**TALKING POINTS: U.S. ATTORNEY NOMINATIONS AND INTERIM
APPOINTMENTS BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL**

Overview:

- In every single case, it is a goal of the Bush Administration to have a U.S. Attorney that is confirmed by the Senate. Use of the AG's appointment authority is in no way an attempt to circumvent the confirmation process. To the contrary, when a United States Attorney submits his or her resignation, the Administration has an obligation to ensure that someone is able to carry out the important function of leading a U.S. Attorney's office during the period when there is not a presidentially-nominated, senate-confirmed (PAS) U.S. Attorney. Whenever a U.S. Attorney vacancy arises, we consult with the home-state Senators about candidates for nomination.
- Our record since the AG-appointment authority was amended demonstrates we are committed to working with the Senate to nominate candidates for U.S. Attorney positions. Every single time that a United States Attorney vacancy has arisen, the President either has made a nomination or the Administration is working, in consultation with home-State Senators, to select candidates for nomination.
 - ✓ Specifically, since March 9, 2006 (when the AG's appointment authority was amended), the Administration has nominated 16 individuals to serve as U.S. Attorney (12 have been confirmed to date).

U.S. Attorneys Serve at the Pleasure of the President:

- United States Attorneys are at the forefront of the Department of Justice's efforts. They are leading the charge to protect America from acts of terrorism; reduce violent crime, including gun crime and gang crime; enforce immigration laws; fight illegal drugs, especially methamphetamine; combat crimes that endanger children and families like child pornography, obscenity, and human trafficking; and ensure the integrity of the marketplace and of government by prosecuting corporate fraud and public corruption.
- The Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General are responsible for evaluating the performance the United States Attorneys and ensuring that United States Attorneys are leading their offices effectively.
- United States Attorneys serve at the pleasure of the President. Thus, like other high-ranking Executive Branch officials, they may be removed for any reason or no reason. That on occasion in an organization as large as the Justice Department some United States Attorneys are removed, or are asked or encouraged to resign, should come as no surprise. United States Attorneys never are removed, or asked or encouraged to resign, in an effort to retaliate against them or interfere with or

DAG00000813

inappropriately influence a particular investigation, criminal prosecution or civil case.

- Whenever a vacancy occurs, we act to fill it in compliance with our obligations under the Constitution, the laws of the United States, and in consultation with the home-state Senators. The Senators have raised concerns based on a misunderstanding of the facts surrounding the resignations of a handful of U.S. Attorneys, each of whom have been in office for their full four year term or more.
- The Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General are responsible for evaluating the performance the U.S. Attorneys and ensuring that they are leading their offices effectively. However, U.S. Attorneys are never removed, or asked or encouraged to resign, in an effort to retaliate against them or interfere with or inappropriately influence a particular investigation, criminal prosecution or civil case.

The Administration Must Ensure an Effective Transition When Vacancies Occur:

- When a United States Attorney has submitted his or her resignation, the Administration has -- in every single case -- consulted with home-state Senators regarding candidates for the Presidential nomination and Senate confirmation. The Administration is committed to nominating a candidate for Senate consideration everywhere a vacancy arises, as evidenced by the fact that there have been 124 confirmations of new U.S. Attorneys since January 20, 2001.
- With 93 U.S. Attorney positions across the country, the Department often averages between 8-15 vacancies at any given time. Because of the important work conducted by these offices, and the need to ensure that the office is being managed effectively and appropriately, the Department uses a range of options to ensure continuity of operations.
- In some cases, the First Assistant U.S. Attorney is an appropriate choice. However, in other cases, the First Assistant may not be an appropriate option for reasons including that he or she: resigns or retires at the same time as the outgoing U.S. Attorney; indicates that he/she does not want to serve as Acting U.S. Attorney; has ongoing or completed OPR or IG matters in their file, which may make his/her elevation to the Acting role inappropriate; or is subject of an unfavorable recommendation by the outgoing U.S. Attorney or otherwise does not enjoy the confidence of those responsible for ensuring ongoing operations and an appropriate transition until such time as a new U.S. Attorney is nominated and confirmed by the Senate. In those cases, the Attorney General has appointed another individual to lead the office during the transition, often another senior manager from that office or an experienced attorney from within the Department.

DAG00000814

The Administration Is Nominating Candidates for U.S. Attorney Positions:

- Since March 9, 2006, when the appointment authority was amended, the Administration has nominated 16 individuals for Senate consideration (12 have been confirmed to date).
- Since March 9, 2006, when the appointment authority was amended, 18 vacancies have been created. Of those 18 vacancies, the Administration nominated candidates to fill 6 of these positions (3 were confirmed to date), has interviewed candidates for 8 positions, and is waiting to receive names to set up interviews for the remaining positions – all in consultation with home-state Senators.

The 18 Vacancies Were Filled on an Interim Basis Using a Range of Authorities, in Order To Ensure an Effective and Smooth Transition:

- In 7 cases, the First Assistant was selected to lead the office and took over under the Vacancy Reform Act's provision at: 5 U.S.C. § 3345(a)(1). That authority is limited to 210 days, unless a nomination is made during that period.
- In 1 case, the First Assistant was selected to lead the office and took over under the Vacancy Reform Act's provision at: 5 U.S.C. § 3345(a)(1). However, the First Assistant took federal retirement a month later and the Department had to select another Department employee to serve as interim under AG appointment until such time as a nomination is submitted to the Senate.
- In 10 cases, the Department selected another Department employee to serve as interim under AG appointment until such time as a nomination is submitted to the Senate. In 1 of those 10 cases, the First Assistant had resigned at the same time as the U.S. Attorney, creating a need for an interim until such time as a nomination is submitted to the Senate.

Amending the Statute Was Necessary:

- Last year's amendment to the Attorney General's appointment authority was necessary and appropriate.
- We are aware of no other federal agency where federal judges, members of a separate branch of government and not the head of the agency, appoint interim staff on behalf of the agency.
- Prior to the amendment, the Attorney General could appoint an interim United States Attorney for only 120 days; thereafter, the district court was authorized to appoint an interim United States Attorney. In cases where a Senate-confirmed United States Attorney could not be appointed within 120 days, the limitation on the Attorney General's appointment authority resulted in numerous, recurring problems.

DAG00000815

- The statute was amended for several reasons:
 - 1) The previous provision was constitutionally-suspect in that it is inappropriate and inconsistent with sound separation of powers principles to vest federal courts with the authority to appoint a critical Executive Branch officer such as a United States Attorney;
 - 2) Some district courts – recognizing the oddity of members of one branch of government appointing officers of another and the conflicts inherent in the appointment of an interim United States Attorney who would then have many matters before the court – refused to exercise the court appointment authority, thereby requiring the Attorney General to make successive, 120-day appointments;
 - 3) Other district courts – ignoring the oddity and the inherent conflicts – sought to appoint as interim United States Attorney wholly unacceptable candidates who did not have the appropriate experience or the necessary clearances.
- Court appointments raise significant conflict questions. After being appointed by the court, the judicial appointee would have authority for litigating the entire federal criminal and civil docket for this period before the very district court to whom he was beholden for his appointment. Such an arrangement at a minimum gives rise to an appearance of potential conflict that undermines the performance of not just the Executive Branch, but also the Judicial one. Furthermore, prosecutorial authority should be exercised by the Executive Branch in a unified manner, with consistent application of criminal enforcement policy under the supervision of the Attorney General.
- Because the Administration is committed to having a Senate-confirmed United States Attorney in all districts, changing the law to restore the limitations on the Attorney General's appointment authority is unnecessary.

DAG00000816

FACT SHEET: UNITED STATES ATTORNEY APPOINTMENTS

NOMINATIONS AFTER AMENDMENT TO ATTORNEY GENERAL'S APPOINTMENT AUTHORITY

Since March 9, 2006, when the Congress amended the Attorney General's authority to appoint interim United States Attorneys, the President has nominated 16 individuals to serve as United States Attorney. The 16 nominations are:

- **Erik Peterson** – Western District of Wisconsin;
- **Charles Rosenberg** – Eastern District of Virginia;
- **Thomas Anderson** – District of Vermont;
- **Martin Jackley** – District of South Dakota;
- **Alexander Acosta** – Southern District of Florida;
- **Troy Eid** – District of Colorado;
- **Phillip Green** – Southern District of Illinois;
- **George Holding** – Eastern District of North Carolina;
- **Sharon Potter** – Northern District of West Virginia;
- **Brett Tolman** – District of Utah;
- **Rodger Heaton** – Central District of Illinois;
- **Deborah Rhodes** – Southern District of Alabama;
- **Rachel Paulose** – District of Minnesota;
- **John Wood** – Western District of Missouri;
- **Rosa Rodriguez-Velez** – District of Puerto Rico; and
- **Jeffrey Taylor** – District of Columbia.

All but Phillip Green, John Wood, Rosa Rodriguez-Velez, and Jeffrey Taylor have been confirmed by the Senate – 12 of 16 nominations.

VACANCIES AFTER AMENDMENT TO ATTORNEY GENERAL'S APPOINTMENT AUTHORITY

Since March 9, 2006, there have been 18 new U.S. Attorney vacancies that have arisen. They have been filled as noted below.

For 7 of the 18 vacancies, the First Assistant United States Attorney (FAUSA) in the district was selected to lead the office in an acting capacity under the Vacancies Reform Act, *see* 5 U.S.C. § 3345(a)(1) (first assistant may serve in acting capacity for 210 days unless a nomination is made) until a nomination could be or can be submitted to the Senate. Those districts are:

- **Central District of California** – FAUSA George Cardona is acting United States Attorney

DAG000000817

- **Southern District of Illinois** – FAUSA Randy Massey is acting United States Attorney (a nomination was made last Congress for Phillip Green, but confirmation did not occur);
- **Eastern District of North Carolina** – FAUSA George Holding served as acting United States Attorney (Holding was nominated and confirmed);
- **Northern District of West Virginia** – FAUSA Rita Valdrini served as acting United States Attorney (Sharon Potter was nominated and confirmed);
- **Southern District of Georgia** – FAUSA Edmund A. Booth, Jr. is acting USA;
- **District of New Mexico** – FAUSA Larry Gomez is acting USA; and
- **District of Nevada** – FAUSA Steven Myhre is acting USA.

For 1 vacancy, the Department first selected the First Assistant United States Attorney to lead the office in an acting capacity under the Vacancies Reform Act, but the First Assistant retired a month later. At that point, the Department selected another employee to serve as interim United States Attorney until a nomination could be submitted to the Senate, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 546(a) (“Attorney General may appoint a United States attorney for the district in which the office of United States attorney is vacant”). This district is:

- **Northern District of Iowa** – FAUSA Judi Whetstone was acting United States Attorney until she retired and Matt Dummermuth was appointed interim United States Attorney.

For 10 of the 18 vacancies, the Department selected another Department employee to serve as interim United States Attorney until a nomination could be submitted to the Senate, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 546(a) (“Attorney General may appoint a United States attorney for the district in which the office of United States attorney is vacant”). Those districts are:

- **Eastern District of Virginia** – Pending nominee Chuck Rosenberg was appointed interim United States Attorney when incumbent United States Attorney resigned to be appointed Deputy Attorney General (Rosenberg was confirmed shortly thereafter);
- **Eastern District of Arkansas** – Tim Griffin was appointed interim United States Attorney when incumbent United States Attorney resigned;
- **District of Columbia** – Jeff Taylor was appointed interim United States Attorney when incumbent United States Attorney resigned to be appointed Assistant Attorney General for the National Security Division (Taylor has been nominated to fill the position permanently);
- **District of Nebraska** – Joe Stecher was appointed interim United States Attorney when incumbent United States Attorney resigned to be appointed Chief Justice of Nebraska Supreme Court;
- **Middle District of Tennessee** – Craig Morford was appointed interim United States Attorney when incumbent United States Attorney resigned;
- **Western District of Missouri** – Brad Schlozman was appointed interim United States Attorney when incumbent United States Attorney and FAUSA resigned at the same time (John Wood was nominated);

DAG00000818

- **Western District of Washington** – Jeff Sullivan was appointed interim United States Attorney when incumbent United States Attorney resigned;
- **District of Arizona** – Dan Knauss was appointed interim United States Attorney when incumbent United States Attorney resigned;
- **Northern District of California** – Scott Schools was appointed interim United States Attorney when incumbent United States Attorney resigned; and
- **Southern District of California** – Karen Hewitt was appointed interim United States Attorney when incumbent United States Attorney resigned.

ATTORNEY GENERAL APPOINTMENTS AFTER AMENDMENT TO ATTORNEY GENERAL'S APPOINTMENT AUTHORITY

The Attorney General has exercised the authority to appoint interim United States Attorneys a total of 14 times since the authority was amended in March 2006.

In 2 of the 14 cases, the FAUSA had been serving as acting United States Attorney under the Vacancies Reform Act (VRA), but the VRA's 210-day period expired before a nomination could be made. Thereafter, the Attorney General appointed that same FAUSA to serve as interim United States Attorney. These districts include:

- **District of Puerto Rico** – Rosa Rodriguez-Velez (Rodriguez-Velez has been nominated); and
- **Eastern District of Tennessee** – Russ Dedrick

In 1 case, the FAUSA had been serving as acting United States Attorney under the VRA, but the VRA's 210-day period expired before a nomination could be made. Thereafter, the Attorney General appointed another Department employee to serve as interim United States Attorney until a nomination could be submitted to the Senate. That district is:

- **District of Alaska** – Nelson Cohen

In 1 case, the Department originally selected the First Assistant to serve as acting United States Attorney; however, she retired from federal service a month later. At that point, the Department selected another Department employee to serve as interim United States Attorney until a nomination could be submitted to the Senate. That district is:

- **Northern District of Iowa** – Matt Dummermuth

In the 10 remaining cases, the Department selected another Department employee to serve as interim United States Attorney until a nomination could be submitted to the Senate. Those districts are:

- **Eastern District of Virginia** – Pending nominee Chuck Rosenberg was appointed interim United States Attorney when incumbent United States Attorney

DAG00000819

resigned to be appointed Deputy Attorney General (Rosenberg was confirmed shortly thereafter);

- **Eastern District of Arkansas** – Tim Griffin was appointed interim United States Attorney when incumbent United States Attorney resigned;
- **District of Columbia** – Jeff Taylor was appointed interim United States Attorney when incumbent United States Attorney resigned to be appointed Assistant Attorney General for the National Security Division;
- **District of Nebraska** – Joe Stecher was appointed interim United States Attorney when incumbent United States Attorney resigned to be appointed Chief Justice of Nebraska Supreme Court;
- **Middle District of Tennessee** – Craig Morford was appointed interim United States Attorney when incumbent United States Attorney resigned;
- **Western District of Missouri** – Brad Schlozman was appointed interim United States Attorney when incumbent United States Attorney and FAUSA resigned at the same time (John Wood was nominated);
- **Western District of Washington** – Jeff Sullivan was appointed interim United States Attorney when incumbent United States Attorney resigned;
- **District of Arizona** – Dan Knauss was appointed interim United States Attorney when incumbent United States Attorney resigned;
- **Northern District of California** – Scott Schools was appointed interim United States Attorney when incumbent United States Attorney resigned; and
- **Southern District of California** – Karen Hewitt was appointed interim United States Attorney when incumbent United States Attorney resigned.

DAG00000820

WHY 120 DAYS IS NOT REALISTIC

- One hundred twenty days is not a realistic period of time to permit any Administration to **solicit and wait for home-state political leaders to identify a list of potential candidates**, provide the time needed to **interview and select a candidate for background investigation**, provide the FBI with adequate time to **do the full-field background investigation**, **prepare and submit the nomination**, and to be followed by the Senate's review and confirmation of a new U.S. Attorney.
- **The average number of days between the resignation of one Senate-confirmed U.S. Attorney and the President's nomination of a candidate for Senate consideration is 273 days** (including 250 USAs during the Clinton Administration and George W. Bush Administration to date). Once nominated, the Senate has taken an additional period of time to review the nominations of the Administration's law enforcement officials.
- **The average number of days between the nomination of a new U.S. Attorney candidate and Senate confirmation has been 58 days for President George W. Bush's USA nominees** (note - the majority were submitted to a Senate that was controlled by the same party as the President) and **81 days for President Bill Clinton's USA nominees** (note - 70% of nominees were submitted in the first two years to a Senate controlled by the same party as the President, others were submitted in the later six years to a party that was not).
- Simply adding the two averages of 273 and 58 days would mean a **combined average of 331 days from resignation of one USA to confirmation of the next.**
- The substantial time period between resignation and nomination is often due to factors outside the Administration's control, such as: 1) the Administration is waiting for home-state political leaders to develop and transmit their list of names for the Administration to begin interviewing candidates; 2) the Administration is awaiting feedback from home-state Senators on the individual selected after the interviews to move forward into background; and 3) the Administration is waiting for the FBI to complete its full-field background review. (The FBI often uses 2-4 months to do the background investigation -- and sometimes needs additional time if they identify an issue that requires significant investigation.)

DAG00000821

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS' PROSECUTION STATISTICS

This Administration Has Demonstrated that It Values Prosecution Experience. Of the 124 Individuals President George W. Bush Has Nominated Who Have Been Confirmed by the Senate:

- 98 had prior experience as prosecutors (79 %)
 - 71 had prior experience as federal prosecutors (57 %)
 - 54 had prior experience as state or local prosecutors (44%)
- 104 had prior experience as prosecutors or government litigators on the civil side (84 %)

In Comparison, of President Clinton's 122 Nominees Who Were Confirmed by the Senate:

- 84 had prior experience as prosecutors (69 %)
 - 56 had prior experience as federal prosecutors (46 %)
 - 40 had prior experience as state or local prosecutors (33 %)
- 87 had prior experience as prosecutors or government litigators on the civil side (71 %)

Since the Attorney General's Appointment Authority Was Amended on March 9, 2006, the Backgrounds of Our Nominees Has Not Changed. Of the 16 Nominees Since that Time:

- 14 of the 16 had prior experience as prosecutors (88%) – *a higher percentage than before.*
 - 12 of the 16 had prior experience as federal prosecutors (75%) – *a higher percentage than before the change*; 11 were career AUSAs or former career AUSAs and 1 had federal prosecution experience as an Assistant Attorney General of the Civil Rights Division
 - 4 of the 15 nominees had experience as state or local prosecutors (27%)

Those Chosen To Be Acting/Interim U.S. Attorneys since the Attorney General's Appointment Authority Was Amended on March 9, 2006, Have Continued To Be Highly Qualified. Of the 18 districts in which new vacancies have occurred, 19 acting and/or interim appointments have been made:

- 18 of the 19 had prior experience as federal prosecutors (95%)

DAG00000822

Examples of Difficult Transition Situations

Examples of Districts Where Judges Did Not Exercise Their Court Appointment (Making the Attorney General's Appointment Authority Essential To Keep the Position Filled until a Nominee Is Confirmed)

- 1. Southern District of Florida:** In 2005, a vacancy occurred in the SDFL. The Attorney General appointed Assistant Attorney General of the Civil Rights Division, Alex Acosta, for 120 days. At the end of the term, the Court indicated that they had (years earlier) appointed an individual who later became controversial. As a result, the Court indicated that they would not make an appointment unless the Department turned over its internal employee files and FBI background reports, so that the court could review potential candidates' backgrounds. Because those materials are protected under federal law, the Department declined the request. The court then indicated it would not use its authority at all, and that the Attorney General should make multiple, successive appointments. While the selection, nomination, and confirmation of a new U.S. Attorney was underway, the Attorney General made three 120-day appointments of Mr. Acosta. Ultimately, he was selected, nominated, and confirmed to the position.
- 2. Eastern District of Oklahoma:** In 2000-2001, a vacancy occurred in the EDOK. The court refused to exercise the court's authority to make appointments. As a result, the Attorney General appointed Shelly Sperling to three 120-day appointments before Sperling was nominated and confirmed by the Senate (he was appointed by the Attorney General to a fourth 120-day term while the nomination was pending).
- 3. In the Western District of Virginia:** In 2001, a vacancy occurred in the WDVA. The court declined to exercise its authority to make an appointment. As a result, the Attorney General made two successive 120-day appointments (two different individuals).

This problem is not new ...

- 4. The District of Massachusetts.** In 1987, the Attorney General had appointed an interim U.S. Attorney while a nomination was pending before the Senate. The 120-day period expired before the nomination had been reviewed and the court declined to exercise its authority. The Attorney General then made another 120-day appointment. The legitimacy of the second appointment was questioned and was reviewed the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts. The Judge upheld the validity of the second 120-day appointment where the court had declined to make an appointment. See 671 F. Supp. 5 (D. Ma. 1987).

DAG000000823

Examples Where Judges Discussed Appointing or Attempted to Appoint Unacceptable Candidates:

1. **Southern District of West Virginia:** When a U.S. Attorney in the Southern District of West Virginia, David Faber, was confirmed to be a federal judge in 1987, the district went through a series of temporary appointments. Following the Attorney General's 120-day appointment of an individual named Michael Carey, the court appointed another individual as the U.S. Attorney. The court's appointee was not a DOJ-employee at the time and had not been subject of any background investigation. The court's appointee came into the office and started making inquiries into ongoing public integrity investigations, including investigations into Charleston Mayor Michael Roark and the Governor Arch Moore, both of whom were later tried and convicted of various federal charges. The First Assistant United States Attorney, knowing that the Department did not have the benefit of having a background examination on the appointee, believed that her inquiries into these sensitive cases were inappropriate and reported them to the Executive Office for United States Attorneys in Washington, D.C. The Department directed that the office remove the investigative files involving the Governor from the office for safeguarding. The Department further directed that the court's appointee be recused from certain criminal matters until a background examination was completed. During that time, the Reagan Administration sped up Michael Carey's nomination. Carey was confirmed and the court's appointee was replaced within two-three weeks of her original appointment.

2. **South Dakota:**

In 2005, a vacancy arose in South Dakota. The First Assistant United States Attorney (FAUSA) was elevated to serve as acting United States Attorney under the Vacancies Reform Act (VRA) for 210 days. As that appointment neared an end without a nomination having yet been made, the Attorney General made an interim appointment of the FAUSA for a 120-day term. The Administration continued to work to identify a nominee; however, it eventually became clear that there would not be a nomination and confirmation prior to the expiration of the 120-day appointment.

Near the expiration of the 120-day term, the Department contacted the court and requested that the FAUSA be allowed to serve under a court appointment. However, the court was not willing to re-appoint her. The Department proposed a solution to protect the court from appointing someone about whom they had reservations, which was for the court to refrain from making any appointment (as other district courts have sometimes done), which would allow the Attorney General to give the FAUSA a second successive, 120-day appointment.

The Chief Judge instead indicated that he was thinking about appointing a non-DOJ employee, someone without federal prosecution experience, who had not been the subject of a thorough background investigation and did not have the

DAG00000824

necessary security clearances. The Department strongly indicated that it did not believe this was an appropriate individual to lead the office.

The Department then notified the court that the Attorney General intended to ask the FAUSA to resign her 120-day appointment early (without the expiration of the 120-day appointment, the Department did not believe the court's appointment authority was operational). The Department notified the court that since the Attorney General's authority was still in force, he would make a new appointment of another experienced career prosecutor. The Department believed that the Chief Judge indicated his support of this course of action and implemented this plan.

The FAUSA resigned her position as interim U.S. Attorney and the Attorney General appointed the new interim U.S. Attorney (Steve Mullins). A federal judge executed the oath and copies of the Attorney General's order and the press release were sent to the court for their information. There was no response for over 10 days, when a fax arrived stating that the court had also attempted to appoint the non-DOJ individual as the U.S. Attorney.

This created a situation where two individuals had seemingly been appointed by two different authorities. Defense attorneys indicated their intention to challenge ongoing investigations and cases. The Department attempted to negotiate a resolution to this very difficult situation, but was unsuccessful. Litigating the situation would have taken months, during which many of the criminal cases and investigations that were underway would have been thrown into confusion and litigation themselves.

Needing to resolve the matter for the sake of the ongoing criminal prosecutions and litigation, after it was clear that negotiations would resolve the matter, the White House Counsel notified the court's purported appointee that even if his court order was valid and effective, then the President was removing him from that office pursuant to Article II of the Constitution and 28 U.S.C. § 541(c). Shortly thereafter, Mr. Mullins resigned his Attorney General appointment and was recess appointed by President Bush to serve as the U.S. Attorney for the District of South Dakota. The Department continued to work with the home-state Senators and identified and nominated a new U.S. Attorney candidate, who was confirmed by the Senate in the summer of 2006.

- 3. Northern District of California:** In 1998, a vacancy resulted in NDCA, a district suffering from numerous challenges. The district court shared the Department's concerns about the state of the office and discussed the possibility of appointing a non-DOJ employee to take over. The Department found the potential appointment of a non-DOJ employee unacceptable. A confrontation was avoided by the Attorney General's appointment of an experienced prosecutor from Washington, D.C. (Robert Mueller), which occurred with the court's concurrence. Mueller served under an AG appointment for 120 days, after which the district court gave him a court appointment. Eight months later, President Clinton nominated Mueller to fill the position for the rest of his term.

DAG00000825

**TIMOTHY GRIFFIN AS INTERIM UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS**

- The Attorney General appointed Tim Griffin as the interim U.S. Attorney following the resignation of Bud Cummins, who resigned on Dec. 20, 2006. Since early in 2006, Mr. Cummins had been talking about leaving the Department to go into private practice for family reasons.
- Timothy Griffin is highly qualified to serve as the U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Arkansas.
- Mr. Griffin has significant experience as a federal prosecutor at both the Department of Justice and as a military prosecutor. At the time of his appointment, he was serving as a federal prosecutor in the Eastern District of Arkansas. Also, from 2001 to 2002, Mr. Griffin served at the Department of Justice as Special Assistant to the Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division and as a Special Assistant U.S. Attorney in the Eastern District of Arkansas in Little Rock. In this capacity, Mr. Griffin prosecuted a variety of federal cases with an emphasis on firearm and drug cases and organized the Eastern District's Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN) initiative, the Bush Administration's effort to reduce firearm-related violence by promoting close cooperation between State and federal law enforcement, and served as the PSN coordinator.
- Prior to rejoining the Department in the fall of 2006, Mr. Griffin completed a year of active duty in the U.S. Army, and is in his tenth year as an officer in the U.S. Army Reserve, Judge Advocate General's Corps (JAG), holding the rank of Major. In September 2005, Mr. Griffin was mobilized to active duty to serve as an Army prosecutor at Fort Campbell, Ky. At Fort Campbell, he prosecuted 40 criminal cases, including *U.S. v. Mikel*, which drew national interest after Pvt. Mikel attempted to murder his platoon sergeant and fired upon his unit's early morning formation. Pvt. Mikel pleaded guilty to attempted murder and was sentenced to 25 years in prison.
- In May 2006, Tim was assigned to the 501st Special Troops Battalion, 101st Airborne Division and sent to serve in Iraq. From May through August 2006, he served as an Army JAG with the 101st Airborne Division in Mosul, Iraq, as a member of the 172d Stryker Brigade Combat Team Brigade Operational Law Team, for which he was awarded the Combat Action Badge and the Army Commendation Medal.
- Like many political appointees, Mr. Griffin has political experience as well. Prior to being called to active duty, Mr. Griffin served as Special Assistant to the President and Deputy Director of the Office of Political Affairs at the White House, following a stint at the Republican National Committee. Mr. Griffin has also served as Senior Counsel to the House Government Reform Committee, as an Associate Independent Counsel for *In Re: Housing and Urban Development Secretary Henry Cisneros*, and as an associate attorney with a New Orleans law firm.
- Mr. Griffin has very strong academic credentials. He graduated *cum laude* from Hendrix College in Conway, Ark., and received his law degree, *cum laude*, from Tulane Law School. He also attended graduate school at Pembroke College at Oxford University. Mr. Griffin was raised in Magnolia, Ark., and resides in Little Rock with his wife, Elizabeth.
- The Attorney General assured Senator Pryor that we are not circumventing the process by making an interim appointment and that the Administration intended to nominate Mr. Griffin. However, Senator Pryor refused to support Mr. Griffin if he was nominated. As a result of the lack of support shown by his home-state Senators, Mr. Griffin has withdrawn his name from consideration.

DAG00000826

- While the Administration consults with the home-state Senators on a potential nomination, however, the Department must have someone lead the office – and we believe Mr. Griffin is well-qualified to serve in this interim role until such time as a new U.S. Attorney is nominated and confirmed.

DAG000000827

J. TIMOTHY GRIFFIN

EDUCATION

Tulane University Law School. New Orleans, Louisiana. Juris Doctor, *cum laude*, May 1994. Cumulative G.P.A.: 3.25/4.00; Rank: 80/319, Top 25%. Common law and civil law curricula. Legal Research and Writing grade: A.

- Senior Fellow, Legal Research and Writing Program. Taught first year law students legal research and writing.
- Volunteer, The New Orleans Free Tutoring Program, Inc.

Oxford University, Pembroke College. Oxford, England. Graduate School, British and European History, 1990-1991.

- Under-secretary and Treasurer, Oxford University Clay Pigeon Shooting Club.

Hendrix College. Conway, Arkansas. Bachelor of Arts in Economics and Business, *cum laude*, June 1990. Cumulative G.P.A.: Major 3.79/4.00, Overall 3.78/4.00; Rank: 22/210, Top 10%.

- Oxford Overseas Study Course, September 1988-May 1989, Oxford, England.

LEGAL EXPERIENCE

U.S. Attorney (Interim). Eastern District of Arkansas, U.S. Department of Justice. Little Rock, Arkansas. December 2006-present.

- Served as a Special Assistant U.S. Attorney, Eastern District of Arkansas, September-December 2006.

Trial Counsel, U.S. Army JAG Corps. Criminal Law Branch, Office of the Staff Judge Advocate. Fort Campbell, Kentucky, September 2005-May 2006; August-September 2006.

- Successfully prosecuted U.S. v. Mikel, involving a soldier's attempted murder of his platoon sergeant.
- Provided legal advice to E Co., 1st and 3rd Brigade Combat Teams, 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault)(R)(P).
- Prosecuted 40 Army criminal cases at courts-martial and federal criminal cases as a Special Assistant U.S. Attorney, Western District of Kentucky and Middle District of Tennessee, and handled 90 administrative separations.

Brigade Judge Advocate, U.S. Army Judge Advocate General's (JAG) Corps. Operation Iraqi Freedom. Task Force Band of Brothers. 501st STB, 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault). Mosul, Iraq, May-August 2006.

- Served on the Brigade Operational Law Team (BOLT), 172d Stryker Brigade Combat Team, FOB Marez, Iraq.
- Provided legal advice on various topics, including financial investigations, rules of engagement, and rule of law.

Special Assistant to the Assistant Attorney General. Criminal Division, U.S. Department of Justice. Washington, D.C. and Little Rock, Arkansas. March 2001-June 2002.

- Tracked issues for Assistant Attorney General Michael Chertoff and worked with the Office of International Affairs (OIA) on matters involving extradition, provisional arrest and mutual legal assistance treaties (MLATs).
- Prosecuted federal firearm and drug cases and served as the coordinator for Project Safe Neighborhoods, a strategy to reduce firearm-related violence through cooperation between state and federal law enforcement, as a Special Assistant U.S. Attorney, Eastern District of Arkansas, in Little Rock, September 2001-June 2002.

Senior Investigative Counsel. Committee on Government Reform, U.S. House of Representatives. Washington, D.C. January 1997-February 1998; June 1998-September 1999.

- Developed hearing series entitled "National Problems, Local Solutions: Federalism at Work" to highlight innovative and successful reforms at the state and local levels, including: "Fighting Crime in the Trenches," featuring New York City Mayor Rudolph Giuliani, and "Tax Reform in the States."
- Pursuant to the Committee's campaign finance investigation, interviewed Johnny Chung and played key role in hearing detailing his illegal political contributions; organized, supervised and conducted the financial investigation of individuals and entities; interviewed witnesses; drafted subpoenas; and briefed Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich.

Associate Independent Counsel. U.S. Office of Independent Counsel David M. Barrett. *In re: Henry G. Cisneros, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)*. Washington, D.C. September 1995-January 1997.

- Interviewed numerous witnesses with the F.B.I. and supervised the execution of a search warrant.
- Drafted subpoenas and pleadings and questioned witnesses before a federal grand jury.

DAG00000828

Associate Attorney. General Litigation Section. Jones, Walker, Waechter, Poitevent, Carrere & Denegre, L.L.P. New Orleans, Louisiana. September 1994-September 1995.

- Drafted legal memoranda and pleadings and conducted depositions.

ADDITIONAL WORK EXPERIENCE

Special Assistant to the President and Deputy Director. Office of Political Affairs, The White House. Washington, D.C. April-September 2005. On military leave after mobilization to active duty, September 2005-September 2006.

- Advised President George W. Bush and Vice-President Richard B. Cheney.
- Organized and coordinated support for the President's agenda.

Research Director and Deputy Communications Director. 2004 Presidential Campaign, Republican National Committee (RNC). Washington, D.C. June 2002-December 2004.

- Briefed Vice-President Richard B. Cheney and other Bush-Cheney 2004 (BC04) and RNC senior staff.
- Managed RNC Research, the primary research resource for BC04, with over 25 staff.
- Worked daily with BC04 senior staff on campaign and press strategy, ad development and debate preparation.

Deputy Research Director. 2000 Presidential Campaign, Republican National Committee (RNC). Washington, D.C. September 1999-February 2001.

- Managed RNC Research, the primary research resource for Bush-Cheney 2000 (BC00), with over 30 staff.
- Served as legal advisor in Volusia and Brevard Counties for BC00 Florida Recount Team.

Campaign Manager. Betty Dickey for Attorney General. Pine Bluff, Arkansas. February 1998-May 1998.

SUMMARY OF MILITARY SERVICE

Major. JAG Corps, U.S. Army Reserve. Commissioned First Lieutenant, June 1996.

- Served on active duty in Mosul, Iraq with the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault), and at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, September 2005-September 2006.
- Authorized to wear 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault) "Screaming Eagle" combat patch.
- **Medals, Ribbons and Badges:** Army Commendation Medal with Five Oak Leaf Clusters; Army Achievement Medal with Four Oak Leaf Clusters; Army Reserve Components Achievement Medal with Two Oak Leaf Clusters; National Defense Service Medal; Iraq Campaign Medal; Global War on Terrorism Service Medal; Armed Forces Reserve Medal with Bronze Hourglass and "M" Devices; Army Service Ribbon; and Army Reserve Overseas Training Ribbon with "3" Device; and Combat Action Badge.

ACTIVITIES AND ASSOCIATIONS

Arkansas Bar Association. Little Rock, Arkansas. *Member*, 1995-present. Annual Meeting Subcommittee on Technology, 2002. Admitted to Arkansas Bar, April 26, 1995.

Friends of Central Arkansas Libraries (FOCAL). Little Rock, Arkansas. *Life Member*.

Florence Crittenton Services, Inc. Little Rock, Arkansas. *Member*, Board of Directors, 2001-2002.

Louisiana State Bar Association. New Orleans, Louisiana. *Member*. Admitted October 7, 1994. Currently inactive.

The Oxford Union Society. Oxford, England. *Member*, 1990-present.

Pulaski County Bar Association. Little Rock, Arkansas. *Member*, 2001-2002. *Co-chair*, Law School Liaison Committee, 2001-2002.

Reserve Officers Association. Washington, D.C. *Life Member*.

Elston, Michael (ODAG)

From: Chiara, Margaret M. (USAMIW) [MM.Chiara@usdoj.gov]
Sent: Sunday, March 04, 2007 11:00 PM
To: McNulty, Paul J
Cc: Elston, Michael (ODAG)
Subject: WDMI

Paul: I respectfully request that you reconsider the rationale of poor performance as the basis for my dismissal. It is in our mutual interest to retract this erroneous explanation while there is still time. Please simply state that a presidentially appointed position is not an entitlement. No other explanation is needed.

As you know, I have assiduously avoided public comment by pursuing an informal version of the "witness protection program" in order to elude reporters! However, the legal community in Grand Rapids and organizations throughout Michigan are outraged that I am being labeled "a poor performer". Politics may not be a pleasant reason but the truth is compelling. Know that I am considered a personification of ethics and productivity. And as you surely realize, the unresolved Phil Green situation has definitely complicated the perception of DOJ in WDMI.

The notoriety of being one of the "USA-8" coupled with my age being constantly cited in the press is proving to be a formidable obstacle to securing employment. The best resolution with regard to both timing and outcome is the assistant director position at the NAC. I have already made it clear to the OLE Director that you do not consider former United States Attorney status a barrier to continued DOJ service. I ask that you endorse or otherwise encourage my selection for reasons discussed in previous e-mails. Given the quality and quantity of my contribution during the past 5+ years, I am confident that you are willing to provide affirmative assistance.

Margaret

3/13/2007

DAG00000830

Elston, Michael (ODAG)

From: Moschella, William
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2007 10:02 AM
To: Roehrkaase, Brian; Scolinos, Tasia; Sampson, Kyle; Goodling, Monica; Hertling, Richard; Elston, Michael (ODAG)
Subject: Opening statement
Attachments: Hearing1.doc



Hearing1.doc (34
KB)

William E. Moschella
Opening Statement

Madam Chairman, Mr. Cannon, and Members of the Subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to testify today on H.R. 580, and although this hearing is styled as a legislative hearing, I am sure that most questions will focus on the circumstances surrounding the Department's request that eight U.S. Attorneys resign. It is to these issues I will address my opening comments.

At the outset, I want to say that the Attorney General appreciates the service of all eight US Attorneys who were asked to resign. They are all professionals, and we have no doubt they will achieve success in their future endeavors.

Given the comments in the papers, these political appointees, who served at the pleasure of the President, disagree with the Attorney General's and Deputy Attorney General's explanation that they were selected because of performance reasons. Both the AG and DAG used the word performance broadly, and depending on the circumstances, performance could encompass issues relating to policy, priorities, management, and leadership.

Given the reaction, I agree with the Washington Post's editorial over the weekend that this situation was handled poorly. The US Attorneys who were asked to resign were not told the reasons simply to avoid protracted debate about the decision and not to prejudice negatively their future employment prospects. A decision was made to let them down easy; in fact, it seems, just the opposite happened. Human nature being what it is; many of them wanted to be told the reasons and in retrospect we should have. The Department's failure to tell them led to wild speculation about our motives and that is unfortunate because faith and confidence in our justice system is more important than any one individual.

That said, the Department stands by its decision. It is clear to us that after our closed door briefings with House and Senate members and staff, some agree with our decisions and some disagree – such is the nature of subjective judgments. Just because you might disagree with a decision, does not mean it was made for improper political reasons – there were reasons for each decision.

It is important to recognize, that one of the most important responsibilities the Attorney General has is to effectively manage the Department of Justice and that requires being willing to make tough decisions. Furthermore, it is the Attorney General's responsibility to ensure that the priorities that he sets and those of the President are carried out. The Attorney General has announced specific priorities and has every expectation that they will be followed. U.S. Attorneys and other political appointees in the Department, like all other departments under all other Presidents, understand that they are charged with carrying out those policies and that they serve at the pleasure of the President.

Let me say a word about the EARS evaluations. Several have made the point that these evaluations indicate good ratings for the US Attorneys. That is not so. The EARS evaluations

DAG00000832

are evaluations of the office. The US Attorneys supervisors are the AG and Deputy AG. They are not asked about the U.S. Attorneys as part of these evaluations.

Finally, we are all privileged to have the opportunity to serve the nation at the Department of Justice, and yes, job security is not the same as if I were a member of the career civil service. No one is entitled to stay in these positions forever. Each US Attorney who was asked to move on served more than their entire four year term

One troubling allegation that has been made is that certain of the U.S. Attorneys were asked to move because actions they took or didn't take relating to public corruptions cases. These charges would be funny if they weren't so serious. Such charges are dangerous, baseless, and irresponsible. This Administration has never removed a United States Attorney in an effort to retaliate against them or interfere with or inappropriately influence a public integrity investigation.

The Attorney General and the FBI director have both made public corruption a very high priority. Integrity in government and trust in our public officials and institutions is paramount. The record of this Justice Department is without question one of great accomplishment and unmatched in recent memory. We have not pulled any punches and shown favoritism. Public corruption investigations should not be rushed or delayed for improper purposes.

In public corruption cases, the professionals at the Department know it is an area that will be scrutinized and we can take the criticism. For example, we have recently been criticized for the plea agreement entered into with President Clinton's former National Security Advisor and or executing search warrants in a particular matter close to an election. No Democrats criticized us for either. Now, however, there is a chorus of partisan criticism for events that have not occurred. There has been no retaliation for the Cunningham case. We applaud it; main Justice has assisted with it; and it continues. And there has been no retaliation for not proceeding fast enough in a public corruption case in New Mexico. According to Mr. Iglesias's comments reported it the press, that matter also continues. Let me make clear what the Attorney General has stated, [insert statement].

Some, particularly in the other body, claim that our reasons for excusing these U.S. Attorneys was to make way for preselected Republican lawyers or to circumvent the Senate's advise and consent role. The facts, however, prove otherwise. Setting aside the situation in Eastern Arkansas, which we have said is different from the rest, we did not have any lawyers identified for these positions. We worked with home state Senators only after we asked the seven to move on. The facts are that since March 9, 2006, the date the new appointment authority went into effect, the Administration has nominated 16 individuals to serve as US Attorney and 12 have been confirmed. Furthermore, 18 vacancies have been created since March 9, 2006. Of those 18 vacancies, the Administration has nominated candidates to fill six of these position (3 have been confirmed), we have interviewed candidates for 8 more, and are waiting to receive names for the remaining four positions – all in consultation with home-state Senators.

DAG00000833

Let me repeat what we have said repeatedly and what the record reflects, in every single case it is the goal of the Bush Administration to have a U.S. Attorney that is confirmed by the Senate.

In conclusion, in hindsight, although the Department continues to believe our decision to remove these individuals was the correct one, it would have been much better to have addressed the relevant issues up front with each U.S. Attorney. Second, no decision was made for inappropriate political reasons and we have never taken [finish conclusion].

DAG000000834

The Department remains focused on making sure that the good work being done by the career lawyers in all of those offices across the country continues uninterrupted and that qualified candidates are nominated as soon as possible for those positions.

DAG00000835

Elston, Michael (ODAG)

From: Moschella, William
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2007 12:51 PM
To: Goodling, Monica; Sampson, Kyle; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard; Scott-Finan, Nancy; Roehrkasse, Brian; Scolinos, Tasia
Subject: Opening Statement Revised
Attachments: Hearing1.doc



Hearing1.doc (34
KB)

William E. Moschella
Opening Statement

Madam Chairman, Mr. Cannon, and Members of the Subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to testify today on H.R. 580. Although this hearing is styled as a legislative hearing, I am sure that most of the questions will focus on the circumstances surrounding the Department's request that eight U.S. Attorneys resign. It is to these issues that I will address my opening comments.

At the outset, I want to say that the Attorney General appreciates the service of all eight U.S. Attorneys who were asked to resign. They are all talented lawyers, and we have no doubt they will achieve success in their future endeavors.

It is apparent that these political appointees, who served at the pleasure of the President, disagree with the Attorney General's and Deputy Attorney General's explanation that they were asked to resign for "performance-related" reasons. Both the Attorney General and Deputy used the word "performance" broadly to include issues relating to policy, priorities, or management.

In hindsight, the Department agrees with The Washington Post's editorial over the weekend that this situation was handled poorly. The US Attorneys who were asked to resign were not provided specific reasons for the request in an effort to avoid protracted debate about the decision and not prejudice negatively their future employment prospects. The Department would have preferred not to talk at all about those reasons, but disclosures in the press and requests for information from Congress altered those best laid plans. A decision was made to let them down easy; in fact, it seems, just the opposite happened. The Department's failure to provide reasons led to wild speculation about our motives and that is unfortunate because faith and confidence in our justice system is more important than any one individual.

That said, the Department stands by its decision. It is clear to us that after our closed door briefings with House and Senate members and staff, some agree with our decisions and some disagree – such is the nature of subjective judgments. Just because you might disagree with a decision, does not mean it was made for improper political reasons – there were reasons for each decision.

It is important to recognize that one of the most important responsibilities the Attorney General has is to manage effectively the Department of Justice and that requires being willing to make tough decisions. Furthermore, it is the Attorney General's responsibility to ensure that the priorities he sets and those of the President are carried out. The Attorney General has announced specific priorities and has every expectation that they will be followed. U.S. Attorneys and other political appointees in the Department, like all other departments under all other presidents understand that they are charged with carrying out those policies and that they serve at the pleasure of the President.

Let me say a word about the EARS evaluations. Several have made the point that these evaluations indicate good ratings for the US Attorneys. That is necessarily so as they are not evaluations of the U.S. Attorneys themselves. The EARS evaluations are evaluations of the

DAG00000837

office. The US Attorneys supervisors are the AG and Deputy AG, and neither are asked about the U.S. Attorneys as part of these evaluations.

One troubling allegation that has been made is that certain of the U.S. Attorneys were asked to move on because actions they took or didn't take relating to public corruptions cases. These charges are dangerous, baseless, and irresponsible. This Administration has never removed a United States Attorney in an effort to retaliate against them or interfere with or inappropriately influence a public integrity investigation.

The Attorney General and the FBI Director have both made public corruption a very high priority. Integrity in government and trust in our public officials and institutions is paramount. The record of this Justice Department is without question one of great accomplishment and unmatched in recent memory. We have not pulled any punches or shown political favoritism. Public corruption investigations should not be rushed or delayed for improper purposes.

In public corruption cases, the professionals at the Department know it is an area that will be scrutinized, and we can take the criticism. For example, we have recently been criticized for the plea agreement entered into with President Clinton's former National Security Advisor and or executing search warrants related to a Republican congressman close to an election. No Democrats criticized us for either. Now, however, there is a chorus of partisan criticism for events that have not occurred. There has been no retaliation for the Cunningham case. We applaud it; main Justice has assisted with it; and it continues. And there has been no retaliation for not proceeding fast enough in a public corruption case in New Mexico. According to Mr. Iglesias's comments reported in the press, that matter also continues.

Some, particularly in the other body, claim that our reasons for excusing these U.S. Attorneys was to make way for preselected Republican lawyers or to circumvent Senate confirmation. The facts, however, prove otherwise. Setting aside the situation in Eastern Arkansas, which we have said was different from the rest, we did not have any lawyers preselected for these positions. We worked with home state Senators only after we asked the seven to move on. The facts are that since March 9, 2006, the date the new appointment authority went into effect, the Administration has nominated 16 individuals to serve as U.S. Attorney and 12 have been confirmed. Furthermore, 18 vacancies have been created since March 9, 2006. Of those 18 vacancies, the Administration has nominated candidates to fill six of these position (3 have been confirmed); we have interviewed candidates for 8 more, and are waiting to receive names for the remaining four positions – all in consultation with home-state Senators. Let me repeat what we have said repeatedly and what the record reflects, in every single case it is the goal of the Bush Administration to have a U.S. Attorney that is confirmed by the Senate.

In conclusion, let me make three points. First, although the Department continues to believe our decision to remove these individuals was the correct one, it would have been much better to have addressed the relevant issues up front with each U.S. Attorney. Second, we have not taken action to influence any particular public corruption case and would never do so. Third, we never intended to circumvent the confirmation process.

DAG00000838

I would be happy to take your questions.

DAG000000839

Elston, Michael (ODAG)

From: Elston, Michael (ODAG)
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2007 2:58 PM
To: Long, Linda E; Brinkley, Winnie
Subject: Fw:

Importance: High

-----Original Message-----

From: Sampson, Kyle
To: McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Hertling, Richard; Scolinos, Tasia; Battle, Michael (USABO)
CC: Elston, Michael (ODAG); Roehrkasse, Brian; Goodling, Monica; Washington, Tracy T
Sent: Mon Mar 05 14:48:36 2007
Subject: RE:

Okay -- two things:

1. We are set for 5pm at the White House. I need WAVES info from each of you: DOBs and SSNs.
2. Kelley says that among other things they'll want to cover (1) Administration's position on the legislation (Will's written testimony says that we oppose the bill, raising White House concerns); and (2) how we are going to respond substantively to each of the U.S. Attorney's allegations that they were dismissed for improper reasons.

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2007 2:30 PM
To: McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Hertling, Richard; Scolinos, Tasia; Battle, Michael (USABO)
Cc: Elston, Michael (ODAG); Roehrkasse, Brian; Goodling, Monica; Washington, Tracy T
Subject: FW:
Importance: High

All; please see the below. I propose to you all that I propose 5pm to Bill -- I assume they'll want us to go over there. Thoughts?

From: Kelley, William K. [mailto:William_K_Kelley@who.eop.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2007 1:57 PM
To: Sampson, Kyle
Subject:

Kyle--We've been tasked with getting a meeting together with you, Paul, Will, DOJ leg and pa, and maybe Battle -- today -- to go over the Administration's position on all aspects of the US Atty issue, including what we are going to say about the proposed legislation and why the US Attys were asked to resign. There's a hearing tomorrow at which Will is scheduled to testify, so we have to get this group together with some folks here asap. Can you look into possible times? Thanks, and sorry to impose.

Elston, Michael (ODAG)

Subject: U.S. Attorneys Meeting
Location: White House

Start: Mon 3/5/2007 5:00 PM
End: Mon 3/5/2007 6:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: (none)

Meeting Status: Not yet responded

Required Attendees: Sampson, Kyle; Goodling, Monica; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Battle, Michael (USAEO); Hertling, Richard; Scolinos, Tasia; Roehrkasse, Brian

Attendees: Will Moschella, Mike Elston, Kyle Sampson, Monica Goodling, Mike Battle, Richard Hertling, Tasia Scolinos, Brian Roehrkasse

POC: Winnie

Elston, Michael (ODAG)

From: Moschella, William
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2007 7:58 PM
To: Sampson, Kyle; McNulty, Paul J; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Goodling, Monica; Hertling, Richard; Scolinos, Tasia; Roehrkasse, Brian
Subject: RE: Moschella Oral Testimony

In the second graph, replace "the President's and the Attorney General's priorities and the Department's policies" with "the Administration's policies and priorities".

In the last graph, I suggest replacing "taken any action" with "asked anyone to resign".

This is really good. Thanks everyone for the collaboration.

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2007 7:27 PM
To: McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Goodling, Monica; Hertling, Richard; Scolinos, Tasia; Roehrkasse, Brian
Subject: FW: Moschella Oral Testimony
Importance: High

Gang, I just sent the below draft Moschella Oral Statement to the White House. Let me know if you have any comments (though I wouldn't mind giving the pen up at this point; let me know).

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2007 7:25 PM
To: 'Kelley, William K.'
Cc: 'Oprison, Christopher G.'
Subject: Moschella Oral Testimony
Importance: High

Bill, can you forward this on to Dana and Cathie (and whomever else in the White House you deem appropriate) for review and approval? Thanks!

<< File: Moschella Oral Statement.doc >>

Kyle Sampson
Chief of Staff
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530
(202) 514-2001 wk.
(202) 305-5289 cell
kyle.sampson@usdoj.gov

Elston, Michael (ODAG)

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2007 10:24 PM
To: Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); McNulty, Paul J
Subject: Re: Moschella Oral Testimony

No concerns here, though I would add your comments in.

-----Original Message-----

From: Moschella, William
To: Elston, Michael (ODAG); McNulty, Paul J
CC: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Mon Mar 05 21:37:13 2007
Subject: FW: Moschella Oral Testimony

Thoughts. I have no problems with the changes.

From: Oprison, Christopher G. [mailto:Christopher_G._Oprison@who.eop.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2007 9:33 PM
To: Moschella, William
Cc: Sampson, Kyle; Kelley, William K.; Scudder, Michael Y.; Fielding, Fred F.; Gibbs, Landon M.
Subject: RE: Moschella Oral Testimony

Will - attached please find a redlined version with suggested edits. Thanks

Chris

From: Sampson, Kyle [mailto:Kyle.Sampson@usdoj.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2007 8:43 PM
To: Oprison, Christopher G.
Cc: Moschella, William
Subject: RE: Moschella Oral Testimony

Thx, Chris. Will now has the pen, so please send the comments to him directly (but cc me, if you would). Thx!

From: Oprison, Christopher G. [mailto:Christopher_G._Oprison@who.eop.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2007 8:40 PM
To: Sampson, Kyle
Subject: RE: Moschella Oral Testimony

we are gathering comments and should have this back to you shortly

From: Sampson, Kyle [mailto:Kyle.Sampson@usdoj.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2007 7:25 PM
To: Kelley, William K.
Cc: Oprison, Christopher G.
Subject: Moschella Oral Testimony
Importance: High

Bill, can you forward this on to Dana and Cathie (and whomever else in the White House you deem appropriate) for review and approval? Thanks!

<<Moschella Oral Statement.doc>>

Kyle Sampson
Chief of Staff
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530
(202) 514-2001 wk.
(202) 305-5289 cell
kyle.sampson@usdoj.gov

Elston, Michael (ODAG)

From: Goodling, Monica
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2007 10:48 PM
To: Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG)
Subject: RE: DRAFT

Elston -- re NV and AZ -- do you know the facts from CRIM's Obscenity task force regarding the details of what happened in those cases?

-----Original Message-----

From: Moschella, William
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2007 10:47 PM
To: Goodling, Monica
Subject: Re: DRAFT

What does it mean that they did not support the obscenity prosecution in their district? Were the cases brought anyway without their support?

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: Goodling, Monica
To: Moschella, William
Sent: Mon Mar 05 21:55:56 2007
Subject: DRAFT

Full doc has all.

<<US Attorney leadership assessment writeup.doc>>

Elston, Michael (ODAG)

From: Elston, Michael (ODAG)
Sent: Tuesday, March 06, 2007 7:54 AM
To: Goodling, Monica; Moschella, William
Subject: Re: DRAFT

I do not. I remember Alice asking us to call them to encourage them to take the cases -- can't remember whether that happened or what became of those cases. Alice will know.

-----Original Message-----

From: Goodling, Monica
To: Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG)
Sent: Mon Mar 05 22:48:21 2007
Subject: RE: DRAFT

Elston -- re NV and AZ -- do you know the facts from CRIM's Obscenity task force regarding the details of what happened in those cases?

-----Original Message-----

From: Moschella, William
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2007 10:47 PM
To: Goodling, Monica
Subject: Re: DRAFT

What does it mean that they did not support the obscenity prosecution in their district? Were the cases brought anyway without their support?

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: Goodling, Monica
To: Moschella, William
Sent: Mon Mar 05 21:55:56 2007
Subject: DRAFT

Full doc has all.

<<US Attorney leadership assessment writeup.doc>>

Elston, Michael (ODAG)

From: Moschella, William
Sent: Tuesday, March 06, 2007 8:10 AM
To: Elston, Michael (ODAG); Goodling, Monica
Subject: Re: DRAFT

Can you call her?

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: Elston, Michael (ODAG)
To: Goodling, Monica; Moschella, William
Sent: Tue Mar 06 07:53:33 2007
Subject: Re: DRAFT

I do not. I remember Alice asking us to call them to encourage them to take the cases -- can't remember whether that happened or what became of those cases. Alice will know.

-----Original Message-----

From: Goodling, Monica
To: Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG)
Sent: Mon Mar 05 22:48:21 2007
Subject: RE: DRAFT

Elston -- re NV and AZ -- do you know the facts from CRIM's Obscenity task force regarding the details of what happened in those cases?

-----Original Message-----

From: Moschella, William
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2007 10:47 PM
To: Goodling, Monica
Subject: Re: DRAFT

What does it mean that they did not support the obscenity prosecution in their district? Were the cases brought anyway without their support?

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: Goodling, Monica
To: Moschella, William
Sent: Mon Mar 05 21:55:56 2007
Subject: DRAFT

Full doc has all.

<<US Attorney leadership assessment writeup.doc>>

Elston, Michael (ODAG)

From: Moschella, William
Sent: Tuesday, March 06, 2007 9:48 AM
To: 'Oprison, Christopher G.'
Cc: Sampson, Kyle; Kelley, William K.; Scudder, Michael Y.; Fielding, Fred F.; Gibbs, Landon M.; Scolinos, Tasia; McNulty, Paul J; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Goodling, Monica
Subject: RE: Moschella Oral Testimony
Attachments: moschellafinal.2.doc; moschellafinal.1.doc

All, attached is the final document. We accepted all of Chris's proposed changes. I have made some other small minor tweaks and those are tracked so that you can see them in "moschellafinal.1.doc" and the clean version is "moschellafinal.2.doc".

From: Oprison, Christopher G. [mailto:Christopher_G._Oprison@who.eop.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2007 9:33 PM
To: Moschella, William
Cc: Sampson, Kyle; Kelley, William K.; Scudder, Michael Y.; Fielding, Fred F.; Gibbs, Landon M.
Subject: RE: Moschella Oral Testimony

Will - attached please find a redlined version with suggested edits. Thanks

Chris

From: Sampson, Kyle [mailto:Kyle.Sampson@usdoj.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2007 8:43 PM
To: Oprison, Christopher G.
Cc: Moschella, William
Subject: RE: Moschella Oral Testimony

Thx, Chris. Will now has the pen, so please send the comments to him directly (but cc me, if you would). Thx!

From: Oprison, Christopher G. [mailto:Christopher_G._Oprison@who.eop.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2007 8:40 PM
To: Sampson, Kyle
Subject: RE: Moschella Oral Testimony

we are gathering comments and should have this back to you shortly

From: Sampson, Kyle [mailto:Kyle.Sampson@usdoj.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2007 7:25 PM
To: Kelley, William K.
Cc: Oprison, Christopher G.
Subject: Moschella Oral Testimony
Importance: High

Bill, can you forward this on to Dana and Cathie (and whomever else in the White House you deem appropriate) for review and approval? Thanks!

DAG000000848

3/12/2007

<<Moschella Oral Statement.doc>>

Kyle Sampson
Chief of Staff
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530
(202) 514-2001 wk.
(202) 305-5289 cell
kyle.sampson@usdoj.gov

William E. Moschella
Opening Statement

Madam Chairman, Mr. Cannon, and Members of the Subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to testify today.

Let me begin by stating clearly that the Department of Justice appreciates the public service that was rendered by the seven U.S. Attorneys who were asked to resign last December. Each is a talented lawyer who served as U.S. Attorney for more than four years, and we have no doubt they will achieve success in their future endeavors – just like the 40 or so other U.S. Attorneys who have resigned for various reasons over the last six years.

Let me also stress that one of the Attorney General's most important responsibilities is to manage the Department of Justice. Part of managing the Department is ensuring that the Administration's priorities and policies are carried out consistently and uniformly. Individuals who have the high privilege of serving as presidential appointees have an obligation to carry out the Administration's priorities and policies.

U.S. Attorneys in the field (as well as Assistant Attorneys General here in Washington) are duty bound not only to make prosecutorial decisions, but also to implement and further the Administration and Department's priorities and policy decisions. In carrying out these responsibilities they serve at the pleasure of the President and report to the Attorney General. If a judgment is made that they are not executing their responsibilities in a manner that furthers the management and policy goals of departmental leadership, then it is appropriate that they be asked to resign so that they can be replaced by other individuals who will.

To be clear, it was for reasons related to policy, priorities and management – what has been referred to broadly as “performance-related” reasons – that these U.S. Attorneys were asked to resign. I want to emphasize that the Department – out of respect for the U.S. Attorneys at issue – would have preferred not to talk at all about those reasons, but disclosures in the press and requests for information from Congress altered those best laid plans. In hindsight, perhaps this situation could have been handled better. These U.S. Attorneys could have been informed at the time they were asked to resign about the reasons for the decision. Unfortunately, our failure to provide reasons to these individual U.S. Attorneys has only served to fuel wild and inaccurate speculation about our motives, and that is unfortunate because faith and confidence in our justice system is more important than any one individual.

That said, the Department stands by the decisions. It is clear that after closed door briefings with House and Senate members and staff, some agree with the reasons that form the basis for our decisions and some disagree – such is the nature of subjective judgments. Just because you might disagree with a decision, does not mean it was made for improper political reasons – there were appropriate reasons for each decision.

One troubling allegation is that certain of these U.S. Attorneys were asked to resign because of actions they took or didn't take relating to public corruption cases. These charges are dangerous, baseless and irresponsible. This Administration has never removed a U.S. Attorney

DAG00000850

to retaliate against them or interfere with or inappropriately influence a public corruption case. Not once.

The Attorney General and the Director of the FBI have made public corruption a high priority. Integrity in government and trust in our public officials and institutions is paramount. Without question, the Department's record is one of great accomplishment that is unmatched in recent memory. The Department has not pulled any punches or shown any political favoritism. Public corruption investigations are neither rushed nor delayed for improper purposes.

Some, particularly in the other body, claim that the Department's reasons for asking these U.S. Attorneys to resign was to make way for preselected Republican lawyers to be appointed and circumvent Senate confirmation. The facts, however, prove otherwise. After the seven U.S. Attorneys were asked to resign last December, the Administration immediately began consulting with home-state Senators and other home-state political leaders about possible candidates for nomination. Indeed, the facts are that since March 9, 2006, the date the Attorney General's new appointment authority went into effect, the Administration has nominated 16 individuals to serve as U.S. Attorney and 12 have been confirmed. Furthermore, 18 vacancies have arisen since March 9, 2006. Of those 18 vacancies, the Administration (1) has nominated candidates for six of them (and of those six, the Senate has confirmed three); (2) has interviewed candidates for eight of them; and (3) is working to identify candidates for the remaining four of them. Let me repeat what has been said many times before and what the record reflects: the Administration is committed to having a Senate-confirmed U.S. Attorney in every single federal district.

In conclusion, let me make three points: First, although the Department stands by the decision to ask these U.S. Attorneys to resign, it would have been much better to have addressed the relevant issues up front with each of them. Second, the Department has not asked anyone to resign to influence any public corruption case – and would never do so. Third, the Administration at no time intended to circumvent the confirmation process.

I would be happy to take your questions.

DAG00000851

William E. Moschella
Opening Statement

Madam Chairman, Mr. Cannon, and Members of the Subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to testify today.

Let me begin by stating clearly that the Department of Justice appreciates the public service that was rendered by the seven U.S. Attorneys who were asked to resign last December. Each is a talented lawyer who served as U.S. Attorney for more than four years, and we have no doubt they will achieve success in their future endeavors – just like the 40 or so other U.S. Attorneys who have resigned for various reasons over the last six years.

Let me also stress that one of the Attorney General's most important responsibilities is to manage the Department of Justice. Part of managing the Department is ensuring that the Administration's priorities and policies are carried out consistently and uniformly. Individuals who have the high privilege of serving as presidential appointees have an obligation to carry out the Administration's priorities and policies.

Deleted: President's and the Attorney General's

Deleted: the Department's

U.S. Attorneys in the field (as well as Assistant Attorneys General here in Washington) are duty bound not only to make prosecutorial decisions, but also to implement and further the Administration and Department's priorities and policy decisions. In carrying out these responsibilities they serve at the pleasure of the President and report to the Attorney General. If a judgment is made that they are not executing their responsibilities in a manner that furthers the management and policy goals of departmental leadership, then it is appropriate that they be asked to resign so that they can be replaced by other individuals who will.

To be clear, it was for reasons related to policy, priorities and management – what has been referred to broadly as “performance-related” reasons – that these U.S. Attorneys were asked to resign. I want to emphasize that the Department – out of respect for the U.S. Attorneys at issue – would have preferred not to talk at all about those reasons, but disclosures in the press and requests for information from Congress altered those best laid plans. In hindsight, perhaps this situation could have been handled better. These U.S. Attorneys could have been informed at the time they were asked to resign about the reasons for the decision. Unfortunately, our failure to provide reasons to these individual U.S. Attorneys has only served to fuel wild and inaccurate speculation about our motives, and that is unfortunate because faith and confidence in our justice system is more important than any one individual.

That said, the Department stands by the decisions. It is clear that after closed door briefings with House and Senate members and staff, some agree with the reasons that form the basis for our decisions and some disagree – such is the nature of subjective judgments. Just because you might disagree with a decision, does not mean it was made for improper political reasons – there were appropriate reasons for each decision.

One troubling allegation is that certain of these U.S. Attorneys were asked to resign because of actions they took or didn't take relating to public corruption cases. These charges are dangerous, baseless and irresponsible. This Administration has never removed a U.S. Attorney

DAG00000852

to retaliate against them or interfere with or inappropriately influence a public corruption case. Not once.

The Attorney General and the Director of the FBI have made public corruption a high priority. Integrity in government and trust in our public officials and institutions is paramount. Without question, the Department's record is one of great accomplishment that is unmatched in recent memory. The Department has not pulled any punches or shown any political favoritism. Public corruption investigations are neither rushed nor delayed for improper purposes.

Deleted: both

Some, particularly in the other body, claim that the Department's reasons for asking these U.S. Attorneys to resign was to make way for preselected Republican lawyers to be appointed and circumvent Senate confirmation. The facts, however, prove otherwise. After the seven U.S. Attorneys were asked to resign last December, the Administration immediately began consulting with home-state Senators and other home-state political leaders about possible candidates for nomination. Indeed, the facts are that since March 9, 2006, the date the Attorney General's new appointment authority went into effect, the Administration has nominated 16 individuals to serve as U.S. Attorney and 12 have been confirmed. Furthermore, 18 vacancies have arisen since March 9, 2006. Of those 18 vacancies, the Administration (1) has nominated candidates for six of them (and of those six, the Senate has confirmed three); (2) has interviewed candidates for eight of them; and (3) is working to identify candidates for the remaining four of them. Let me repeat what has been said many times before and what the record reflects: the Administration is committed to having a Senate-confirmed U.S. Attorney in every single federal district.

Deleted: of them

In conclusion, let me make three points: First, although the Department stands by the decision to ask these U.S. Attorneys to resign, it would have been much better to have addressed the relevant issues up front with each of them. Second, the Department has not asked anyone to resign to influence any public corruption case - and would never do so. Third, the Administration at no time intended to circumvent the confirmation process.

Deleted: taken any action

I would be happy to take your questions.

Deleted:

DAG00000853

Elston, Michael (ODAG)

From: Wade, Jill C
Sent: Tuesday, March 06, 2007 12:27 PM
To: Elston, Michael (ODAG)
Subject: Fw: Cummins email for WEM review
Attachments: Cummins Email.pdf

Perhaps I should have cc'd you on this email.

Jill C. Wade
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Office of Legislative Affairs
(202) 514-3597

-----Original Message-----

From: Wade, Jill C
To: Moschella, William; Scott-Finan, Nancy
CC: Seidel, Rebecca
Sent: Tue Mar 06 11:50:08 2007
Subject: Cummins email for WEM review

I would not be surprised if this email is raised at WEM hearing today. See attached. (I faxed to catalina just now bc I am on Hill). I will have a summary from this SJC hearing on us atty resignations asap. Hearing is still going strong.

J

Jill C. Wade
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Office of Legislative Affairs
(202) 514-3597

-----Original Message-----

From: Cabral, Catalina
To: Wade, Jill C; Scott-Finan, Nancy
Sent: Tue Mar 06 11:30:50 2007
Subject:

<<Cummins Email.pdf>>



Cummins Email.pdf
(57 KB)

Catalina abral
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Office of Legislative Affairs
Catalina.Cabral@USDOJ.gov
(202) 514-4828