an interim basis. When neither the First Assistant nor another senior manager in the office is able or willing to serve as interim U.S. Attorney, or when the appointment of either would not be appropriate in the circumstances, the Department has looked to other, qualified Department employees. For example, in the District of Minnesota and the Northern District of Iowa, the First Assistant took federal retirement at or near the same time that the U.S. Attorney resigned, which required the Department to select another official to lead the office.

At no time, however, has the Administration sought to avoid the confirmation process in the Senate by appointing an interim U.S. Attorney and then refusing to move forward—in consultation with home-State Senators—on the selection, nomination, confirmation and appointment of a new U.S. Attorney. Not once. In every single case where a vacancy occurs, the Bush Administration is committed to having a United States Attorney who is confirmed by the Senate. And the Administration's actions bear this out. Every time a vacancy has arisen, the President has either made a nomination, or the Administration is working to select candidates for nomination. The appointment of U.S. Attorneys by and with the advice and consent of the Senate is unquestionably the appointment method preferred by the Senate, and it is unquestionably the appointment method preferred by the Administration.

Since January 20, 2001, 125 new U.S. Attorneys have been nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. On March 9, 2006, the Congress amended the Attorney General's authority to appoint interim U.S. Attorneys, and 16 vacancies have occurred since that date. This amendment has not changed our commitment to nominating candidates for Senate confirmation. In fact, the Administration has nominated a total of 15 individuals for Senate consideration since the appointment authority was amended, with 12 of those nominees having been confirmed to date. Of the 16 vacancies that have occurred since the time that the law

was amended, the Administration has nominated candidates to fill five of these positions, has interviewed candidates for nomination for seven more positions, and is waiting to receive names to set up interviews for the remaining positions—all in consultation with home-state Senators.

However, while that nomination process continues, the Department must have a leader in place to carry out the important work of these offices. To ensure an effective and smooth transition during U.S. Attorney vacancies, the office of the U.S. Attorney must be filled on an interim basis. To do so, the Department relies on the Vacancy Reform Act ("VRA"), 5 U.S.C. § 3345(a)(1), when the First Assistant is selected to lead the office, or the Attorney General's appointment authority in 28 U.S.C. § 546 when another Department employee is chosen. Under the VRA, the First Assistant may serve in an acting capacity for only 210 days, unless a nomination is made during that period. Under an Attorney General appointment, the interim U.S. Attorney serves until a nominee is confirmed the Senate. There is no other statutory authority for filling such a vacancy, and thus the use of the Attorney General's appointment authority, as amended last year, signals nothing other than a decision to have an interim U.S. Attorney who is not the First Assistant. It does not indicate an intention to avoid the confirmation process, as some have suggested.

H.R. 580 would supersede last year's amendment to 28 U.S.C. § 546 that authorized the Attorney General to appoint an interim U.S. Attorney to serve until a person fills the position by being confirmed by the Senate and appointed by the President. Last year's amendment was intended to ensure continuity of operations in the event of a U.S. Attorney vacancy that lasts longer than expected. H.R. 580 would institute a new appointment regime without allowing the Attorney General's authority under current law to be tested in practice.

Prior to last year's amendment, the Attorney General could appoint an interim U.S. Attorney for the first 120 days after a vacancy arose; thereafter, the district court was authorized to appoint an interim U.S. Attorney. In cases in which a Senate-confirmed U.S. Attorney could not be appointed within 120 days, the limitation on the Attorney General's appointment authority resulted in recurring problems. Some district courts recognized the conflicts inherent in the appointment of an interim U.S. Attorney who would then have matters before the court—not to mention the oddity of one branch of government appointing officers of another—and simply refused to exercise the appointment authority. In those cases, the Attorney General was consequently required to make multiple successive 120-day interim appointments. Other district courts ignored the inherent conflicts and sought to appoint as interim U.S. Attorneys wholly unacceptable candidates who lacked the required clearances or appropriate qualifications.

Two examples demonstrate the shortcomings of the previous system. During President Reagan's Administration, the district court appointed in the Southern District of West Virginia an interim U.S. Attorney who was neither a Justice Department employee nor a cleared individual. The new U.S. Attorney sought access to law-enforcement sensitive investigative materials related to the office's most sensitive public corruption investigation. The problem was that the interim U.S. Attorney had no clearances or had then undergone a background investigation so that the Attorney General and the Federal Bureau of Investigation could have complete confidence in the individual. The appointment forced the Department to remove the case files from the U.S. Attorney's office and bring them to Washington. In the end, the Department expedited the nomination of the permanent U.S. Attorney and appointed him to replace the court-appointed individual pending his confirmation.

In a second case, occurring in 2005, the district court appointed as interim U.S. Attorney in South Dakota an individual who similarly was not a Department of Justice or federal employee and had never

undergone the appropriate background check. As a result, the interim U.S. Attorney could have no access to classified information. The U.S. Attorney could not receive information from his district's anti-terrorism coordinator, its Joint Terrorism Task Force, or its Field Intelligence Group. In a post 9/11 world, this situation was unacceptable.

Despite these two notorious instances, in most cases, the district courts have simply appointed the Attorney General's choice as interim U.S. Attorney, revealing the fact that most judges have recognized the importance of appointing an interim U.S. Attorney who enjoys the confidence of the Attorney General. In other words, the most important factor in the selection of past court-appointed interim U.S. Attorneys was the Attorney General's recommendation. By foreclosing the possibility of judicial appointment of interim U.S. Attorneys unacceptable to the Administration, last year's amendment to Section 546 appropriately eliminated a procedure that created unnecessary problems without any apparent benefit.

The Department's principal objection to H.R. 580 is that it would be 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 under the circumstances described in the bill. We are aware of no other agency where federal judges—members of a separate branch of government—appoint on an interim basis senior, policymaking staff of an agency. Such a judicial appointee would have authority for litigating the entire federal criminal and civil docket before the very district court to whom he or she was beholden for the appointment. This arrangement, at a minimum, gives rise to an appearance of potential conflict that undermines the performance or perceived performance of both the Executive and Judicial Branches. A judge may be inclined to select a U.S. Attorney who shares the judge's ideological or prosecutorial philosophy. Or a judge may select a prosecutor apt to settle cases and enter plea bargains, so as to preserve judicial resources. *See*

Wiener, Inter-Branch Appointments After the Independent Counsel: Court Appointment of United States Attorneys, 86 Minn. L. Rev. 363, 428 (2001) (concluding that court appointment of interim U.S. Attorneys is unconstitutional).

Prosecutorial authority should be exercised by the Executive Branch in a unified manner, consistent with the application of criminal enforcement policy under the Attorney General. Court-appointed U.S. Attorneys would be at least as accountable to the chief judge of the district court as to the Attorney General, which could, in some circumstances become untenable. In no context is accountability more important to our society than on the front lines of law enforcement and the exercise of prosecutorial discretion, and the Department contends that the chief prosecutor should be accountable to the Attorney General, the President, and ultimately the people.

H.R. 580 appears to be aimed at addressing a problem that has not arisen. The Administration has repeatedly demonstrated its commitment to having a Senate-confirmed U.S. Attorney in every federal district. As noted, when a vacancy in the office of U.S. Attorney occurs, the Department typically looks first to the First Assistant or another senior manager in the office to serve as an acting or interim U.S. Attorney. Where neither the First Assistant nor another senior manager is able or willing to serve as an acting or interim U.S. Attorney, or where their service would not be appropriate under the circumstances, the Administration has looked to other Department employees to serve temporarily. No matter which way a U.S. Attorney is temporarily appointed, the Administration has consistently sought, and will continue to seek, to fill the vacancy—in consultation with home-State Senators—with a presidentially-nominated and Senate-confirmed nominee.

If, despite the fact that the Department does not believe a case has been made to repeal the current

authority for appointing interim U.S. Attorneys, this Committee believes an amendment to section 546 is warranted, the Department would urge the Committee to reject H.R. 580.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify, and I look forward to answering the Committee's questions.

Silas, Adrien

From: Green, Richard E. [Richard_E._Green@omb.eop.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2007 1:13 PM
To: Silas, Adrien
Subject: RE: US Atty - ODAG Tstmny

What is happening with this one?

-----Original Message-----
From: Silas, Adrien [mailto:Adrien.Silas@usdoj.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2007 7:12 PM
To: Simms, Angela M.; Green, Richard E.
Subject: US Atty - ODAG Tstmny

HEADS UP: In the morning, we will be submitting testimony for a Tuesday House Judiciary hearing on the U.S. Attorneys. The statement will be substantially the previously cleared testimony for the Senate hearing, including language from the views letter on S. 214. The only new parts of the testimony are two examples of court appointments hindering law enforcement and our recommendations for improvement of the legislation.

Silas, Adrien

From: Silas, Adrien
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2007 1:23 PM
To: Moschella, William; Goodling, Monica; Hertling, Richard
Cc: Scott-Finan, Nancy; Nowacki, John (USAEO)
Subject: FW: US Atty - ODAG Tstmny

Just checking on status, as time is slipping away. Does anyone have further comments on the draft? Is it ready to go to OMB?

-----Original Message-----
From: Green, Richard E. [mailto:Richard_E._Green@omb.eop.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2007 1:13 PM
To: Silas, Adrien
Subject: RE: US Atty - ODAG Tstmny

What is happening with this one?

-----Original Message-----
From: Silas, Adrien [mailto:Adrien.Silas@usdoj.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2007 7:12 PM
To: Simms, Angela M.; Green, Richard E.
Subject: US Atty - ODAG Tstmny

HEADS UP: In the morning, we will be submitting testimony for a Tuesday House Judiciary hearing on the U.S. Attorneys. The statement will be substantially the previously cleared testimony for the Senate hearing, including language from the views letter on S. 214. The only new parts of the testimony are two examples of court appointments hindering law enforcement and our recommendations for improvement of the legislation.

Silas, Adrien

From: Scott-Finan, Nancy
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2007 1:34 PM
To: Silas, Adrien
Cc: Hertling, Richard; Moschella, William; Goodling, Monica
Subject: FW: Moschella testimony

Attachments: DRAFT Moschella Testimony2.doc

DRAFT Moschella Testimony2.doc...

Adrien, pls. forward this version to OMB for clearance and advise that this is substantially the same as our prior testimony and views letter, with an addition of examples where there were difficulties with court appointments. Also. Advise that the number on vacancies and nominations will change and will provide the new numbers once I have them. Thanks much.

Department of Justice

STATEMENT

OF

WILLIAM E. MOSCHELLA
PRINCIPAL ASSOCIATE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

CONCERNING

"H.R. 580, RESTORING CHECKS AND BALANCES IN THE NOMINATION PROCESS OF U.S. ATTORNEYS"

PRESENTED ON

MARCH 6, 2007

Testimony
of

William E. Moschella
Principal Associate Deputy Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice

Committee on the Judiciary
United States House of Representatives

"H.R. 580, Restoring Checks and Balances in the Nomination Process of U.S. Attorneys"

March 6, 2007

Chairman Conyers, Congressman Smith, and members of the Committee, thank you for the invitation to discuss the importance of the Justice Department's United States Attorneys.

The Department of Justice strongly opposes H.R. 580, the "Preserving United States Attorneys Independence Act of 2007." H.R. 580 would significantly alter the manner in which U.S. Attorney vacancies are filled by completely removing the Attorney General's authority to appoint interim U.S. Attorneys and allocating that authority to an entirely different branch of government. Under H.R. 580, the Attorney General would have no authority whatsoever to fill a U.S. Attorney vacancy on an interim basis—even one of short duration. Instead, only the district court would have this authority.

As the chief federal law-enforcement officers in their districts, our 93 U.S. Attorneys represent the Attorney General and the Department of Justice throughout the United States. U.S. Attorneys are not just prosecutors; they are government officials charged with managing and implementing the policies and priorities of the President and the Attorney General. The Attorney General has set forth key priorities for the Department

of Justice, and in each of their districts, U.S. Attorneys lead the Department's efforts to protect America from terrorist attacks and fight violent crime, combat illegal drug trafficking, ensure the integrity of government and the marketplace, enforce our immigration laws, and prosecute crimes that endanger children and families—including child pornography, obscenity, and human trafficking.

United States Attorneys serve at the pleasure of the President. Like any other high-ranking officials in the Executive Branch, they may be removed for any reason or no reason. The Department of Justice—including the office of United States Attorney—was created precisely so that the government's legal business could be effectively managed and carried out through a coherent program under the supervision of the Attorney General. Unlike judges, who are supposed to act independently of those who nominate them, U.S. Attorneys are accountable to the Attorney General, and through him, to the President—the head of the Executive Branch. This accountability ensures compliance with Department policy, and is often recognized by the Members of Congress who write to the Department to encourage various U.S. Attorneys' Offices to focus on a particular area of law enforcement.

The Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General are responsible for evaluating the performance of the United States Attorneys and ensuring that they are leading their offices effectively. It should come as no surprise to anyone that, in an organization as large as the Justice Department, U.S. Attorneys are removed or asked or encouraged to resign from time to time. However, in this Administration U.S. Attorneys are never—repeat, 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. Any suggestion to the contrary is unfounded, and it irresponsibly undermines the reputation for impartiality the Department has earned over many years and on which it depends.

Turnover in the position of U.S. Attorney is not uncommon and should be expected, particularly after a U.S. Attorney's four-year term has expired. When a presidential election results in a change of administration, every U.S. Attorney leaves and the new President nominates a successor for confirmation by the Senate. Moreover, U.S. Attorneys do not necessarily stay in place even during an administration. For example, approximately half of the U.S. Attorneys appointed at the beginning of the Bush Administration had left office by the end of 2006. Of the U.S. Attorneys whose resignations have been the subject of recent discussion, each one had served longer than four years prior to being asked to resign.

Given the reality of turnover among the United States Attorneys, our system depends heavily on the dedicated service of the career investigators and prosecutors. While a new U.S. Attorney may articulate new priorities or emphasize different types of cases, the effect of a U.S. Attorney's departure on an existing investigation is, in fact, minimal, and that is as it should be. The career civil servants who prosecute federal criminal cases are dedicated professionals and an effective U.S. Attorney relies on the professional judgment of those prosecutors.

The leadership of an office is more than the direction of individual cases. It involves managing limited resources, maintaining high morale in the office, and building relationships with federal, state, and local law enforcement partners. When a U.S. Attorney submits his or her resignation, the Department must first determine who will serve temporarily as interim U.S. Attorney. The Department 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-appointed, Senate-confirmed United States Attorney. Often, the Department looks to the First Assistant U.S. Attorney or another senior manager in the office to serve as U.S. Attorney on

an interim basis. When neither the First Assistant nor another senior manager in the office is able or willing to serve as interim U.S. Attorney, or when the appointment of either would not be appropriate in the circumstances, the Department has looked to other, qualified Department employees. For example, in the District of Minnesota and the Northern District of Iowa, the First Assistant took federal retirement at or near the same time that the U.S. Attorney resigned, which required the Department to select another official to lead the office.

At no time, however, has the Administration sought to avoid the confirmation process in the Senate by appointing an interim U.S. Attorney and then refusing to move forward—in consultation with home-State Senators—on the selection, nomination, confirmation and appointment of a new U.S. Attorney. Not once. In every single case where a vacancy occurs, the Bush Administration is committed to having a United States Attorney who is confirmed by the Senate. And the Administration's actions bear this out. Every time a vacancy has arisen, the President has either made a nomination, or the Administration is working to select candidates for nomination. The appointment of U.S. Attorneys by and with the advice and consent of the Senate is unquestionably the appointment method preferred by the Senate, and it is unquestionably the appointment method preferred by the Administration.

Since January 20, 2001, 125 new U.S. Attorneys have been nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. On March 9, 2006, the Congress amended the Attorney General's authority to appoint interim U.S. Attorneys, and 16 vacancies have occurred since that date. This amendment has not changed our commitment to nominating candidates for Senate confirmation. In fact, the Administration has nominated a total of 15 individuals for Senate consideration since the appointment authority was amended, with 12 of those nominees having been confirmed to date. Of the 16 vacancies that have occurred since the time that the law

was amended, the Administration has nominated candidates to fill five of these positions, has interviewed candidates for nomination for seven more positions, and is waiting to receive names to set up interviews for the remaining positions—all in consultation with home-state Senators.

However, while that nomination process continues, the Department must have a leader in place to carry out the important work of these offices. To ensure an effective and smooth transition during U.S. Attorney vacancies, the office of the U.S. Attorney must be filled on an interim basis. To do so, the Department relies on the Vacancy Reform Act ("VRA"), 5 U.S.C. § 3345(a)(1), when the First Assistant is selected to lead the office, or the Attorney General's appointment authority in 28 U.S.C. § 546 when another Department employee is chosen. Under the VRA, the First Assistant may serve in an acting capacity for only 210 days, unless a nomination is made during that period. Under an Attorney General appointment, the interim U.S. Attorney serves until a nominee is confirmed the Senate. There is no other statutory authority for filling such a vacancy, and thus the use of the Attorney General's appointment authority, as amended last year, signals nothing other than a decision to have an interim U.S. Attorney who is not the First Assistant. It does not indicate an intention to avoid the confirmation process, as some have suggested.

H.R. 580 would supersede last year's amendment to 28 U.S.C. § 546 that authorized the Attorney General to appoint an interim U.S. Attorney to serve until a person fills the position by being confirmed by the Senate and appointed by the President. Last year's amendment was intended to ensure continuity of operations in the event of a U.S. Attorney vacancy that lasts longer than expected. H.R. 580 would institute a new appointment regime without allowing the Attorney General's authority under current law to be tested in practice.

Prior to last year's amendment, the Attorney General could appoint an interim U.S. Attorney for the first 120 days after a vacancy arose; thereafter, the district court was authorized to appoint an interim U.S. Attorney. In cases in which a Senate-confirmed U.S. Attorney could not be appointed within 120 days, the limitation on the Attorney General's appointment authority resulted in recurring problems. Some district courts recognized the conflicts inherent in the appointment of an interim U.S. Attorney who would then have matters before the court—not to mention the oddity of one branch of government appointing officers of another—and simply refused to exercise the appointment authority. In those cases, the Attorney General was consequently required to make multiple successive 120-day interim appointments. Other district courts ignored the inherent conflicts and sought to appoint as interim U.S. Attorneys wholly unacceptable candidates who lacked the required clearances or appropriate qualifications.

Two examples demonstrate the shortcomings of the previous system. During President Reagan's Administration, the district court appointed in the Southern District of West Virginia an interim U.S. Attorney who was neither a Justice Department employee nor a cleared individual. The new U.S. Attorney sought access to law-enforcement sensitive investigative materials related to the office's most sensitive public corruption investigation. The problem was that the interim U.S. Attorney had no clearances or had then undergone a background investigation so that the Attorney General and the Federal Bureau of Investigation could have complete confidence in the individual. The appointment forced the Department to remove the case files from the U.S. Attorney's office and bring them to Washington. In the end, the Department expedited the nomination of the permanent U.S. Attorney and appointed him to replace the court-appointed individual pending his confirmation.

In a second case, occurring in 2005, the district court appointed as interim U.S. Attorney in South

Dakota an individual who similarly was not a Department of Justice or federal employee and had never undergone the appropriate background check. As a result, the interim U.S. Attorney could have no access to classified information. The U.S. Attorney could not receive information from his district's anti-terrorism coordinator, its Joint Terrorism Task Force, or its Field Intelligence Group. In a post 9/11 world, this situation was unacceptable.

Despite these two notorious instances, in most cases, the district courts have simply appointed the Attorney General's choice as interim U.S. Attorney, revealing the fact that most judges have recognized the importance of appointing an interim U.S. Attorney who enjoys the confidence of the Attorney General. In other words, the most important factor in the selection of past court-appointed interim U.S. Attorneys was the Attorney General's recommendation. By foreclosing the possibility of judicial appointment of interim U.S. Attorneys unacceptable to the Administration, last year's amendment to Section 546 appropriately eliminated a procedure that created unnecessary problems without any apparent benefit.

The Department's principal objection to H.R. 580 is that it would be 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 under the circumstances described in the bill. We are aware of no other agency where federal judges—members of a separate branch of government—appoint on an interim basis senior, policymaking staff of an agency. Such a judicial appointee would have authority for litigating the entire federal criminal and civil docket before the very district court to whom he or she was beholden for the appointment. This arrangement, at a minimum, gives rise to an appearance of potential conflict that undermines the performance or perceived performance of both the Executive and Judicial Branches. A judge may be inclined to select a U.S. Attorney who shares the judge's ideological or prosecutorial philosophy. Or a judge

may select a prosecutor apt to settle cases and enter plea bargains, so as to preserve judicial resources. *See* Wiener, Inter-Branch Appointments After the Independent Counsel: Court Appointment of United States Attorneys, 86 Minn. L. Rev. 363, 428 (2001) (concluding that court appointment of interim U.S. Attorneys is unconstitutional).

Prosecutorial authority should be exercised by the Executive Branch in a unified manner, consistent with the application of criminal enforcement policy under the Attorney General. Court-appointed U.S. Attorneys would be at least as accountable to the chief judge of the district court as to the Attorney General, which could, in some circumstances become untenable. In no context is accountability more important to our society than on the front lines of law enforcement and the exercise of prosecutorial discretion, and the Department contends that the chief prosecutor should be accountable to the Attorney General, the President, and ultimately the people.

H.R. 580 appears to be aimed at addressing a problem that has not arisen. The Administration has repeatedly demonstrated its commitment to having a Senate-confirmed U.S. Attorney in every federal district. As noted, when a vacancy in the office of U.S. Attorney occurs, the Department typically looks first to the First Assistant or another senior manager in the office to serve as an acting or interim U.S. Attorney. Where neither the First Assistant nor another senior manager is able or willing to serve as an acting or interim U.S. Attorney, or where their service would not be appropriate under the circumstances, the Administration has looked to other Department employees to serve temporarily. No matter which way a U.S. Attorney is temporarily appointed, the Administration has consistently sought, and will continue to seek, to fill the vacancy—in consultation with home-State Senators—with a presidentially-nominated and Senate-confirmed nominee.

If, despite the fact that the Department does not believe a case has been made to repeal the current authority for appointing interim U.S. Attorneys, this Committee believes an amendment to section 546 is warranted, the Department would urge the Committee to reject H.R. 580.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify, and I look forward to answering the Committee's questions.

Silas, Adrien

From: Silas, Adrien
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2007 1:39 PM
To: 'Richard_E._Green@omb.eop.gov'
Subject: FW: US Atty - ODAG Tstmny

Attachments: USAttys01.doc.doc

The draft statement is attached. We apologize for the delay.

USAttys01.doc.doc
(86 KB)

-----Original Message-----
From: Green, Richard E. [mailto:Richard_E._Green@omb.eop.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2007 1:13 PM
To: Silas, Adrien
Subject: RE: US Atty - ODAG Tstmny

What is happening with this one?

-----Original Message-----
From: Silas, Adrien [mailto:Adrien.Silas@usdoj.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2007 7:12 PM
To: Simms, Angela M.; Green, Richard E.
Subject: US Atty - ODAG Tstmny

HEADS UP: In the morning, we will be submitting testimony for a Tuesday House Judiciary hearing on the U.S. Attorneys. The statement will be substantially the previously cleared testimony for the Senate hearing, including language from the views letter on S. 214. The only new parts of the testimony are two examples of court appointments hindering law enforcement and our recommendations for improvement of the legislation.

Department of Justice

STATEMENT

OF

WILLIAM E. MOSCHELLA
PRINCIPAL ASSOCIATE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

CONCERNING

"H.R. 580, RESTORING CHECKS AND BALANCES IN THE NOMINATION PROCESS OF U.S. ATTORNEYS"

PRESENTED ON

MARCH 6, 2007

Testimony
of

William E. Moschella
Principal Associate Deputy Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice

Committee on the Judiciary
United States House of Representatives

"H.R. 580, Restoring Checks and Balances in the Nomination Process of U.S. Attorneys"

March 6, 2007

Chairman Conyers, Congressman Smith, and members of the Committee, thank you for the invitation to discuss the importance of the Justice Department's United States Attorneys.

The Department of Justice strongly opposes H.R. 580, the "Preserving United States Attorneys Independence Act of 2007." H.R. 580 would significantly alter the manner in which U.S. Attorney vacancies are filled by completely removing the Attorney General's authority to appoint interim U.S. Attorneys and allocating that authority to an entirely different branch of government. Under H.R. 580, the Attorney General would have no authority whatsoever to fill a U.S. Attorney vacancy on an interim basis—even one of short duration. Instead, only the district court would have this authority.

As the chief federal law-enforcement officers in their districts, our 93 U.S. Attorneys represent the Attorney General and the Department of Justice throughout the United States. U.S. Attorneys are not just prosecutors; they are government officials charged with managing and implementing the policies and priorities of the President and the Attorney General. The Attorney General has set forth key priorities for the Department

of Justice, and in each of their districts, U.S. Attorneys lead the Department's efforts to protect America from terrorist attacks and fight violent crime, combat illegal drug trafficking, ensure the integrity of government and the marketplace, enforce our immigration laws, and prosecute crimes that endanger children and families—including child pornography, obscenity, and human trafficking.

United States Attorneys serve at the pleasure of the President. Like any other high-ranking officials in the Executive Branch, they may be removed for any reason or no reason. The Department of Justice—including the office of United States Attorney—was created precisely so that the government's legal business could be effectively managed and carried out through a coherent program under the supervision of the Attorney General. Unlike judges, who are supposed to act independently of those who nominate them, U.S. Attorneys are accountable to the Attorney General, and through him, to the President—the head of the Executive Branch. This accountability ensures compliance with Department policy, and is often recognized by the Members of Congress who write to the Department to encourage various U.S. Attorneys' Offices to focus on a particular area of law enforcement.

The Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General are responsible for evaluating the performance of the United States Attorneys and ensuring that they are leading their offices effectively. It should come as no surprise to anyone that, in an organization as large as the Justice Department, U.S. Attorneys are removed or asked or encouraged to resign from time to time. However, in this Administration U.S. Attorneys are never—repeat, 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. Any suggestion to the contrary is unfounded, and it irresponsibly undermines the reputation for impartiality the Department has earned over many years and on which it depends.

Turnover in the position of U.S. Attorney is not uncommon and should be expected, particularly after a U.S. Attorney's four-year term has expired. When a presidential election results in a change of administration, every U.S. Attorney leaves and the new President nominates a successor for confirmation by the Senate. Moreover, U.S. Attorneys do not necessarily stay in place even during an administration. For example, approximately half of the U.S. Attorneys appointed at the beginning of the Bush Administration had left office by the end of 2006. Of the U.S. Attorneys whose resignations have been the subject of recent discussion, each one had served longer than four years prior to being asked to resign.

Given the reality of turnover among the United States Attorneys, our system depends heavily on the dedicated service of the career investigators and prosecutors. While a new U.S. Attorney may articulate new priorities or emphasize different types of cases, the effect of a U.S. Attorney's departure on an existing investigation is, in fact, minimal, and that is as it should be. The career civil servants who prosecute federal criminal cases are dedicated professionals and an effective U.S. Attorney relies on the professional judgment of those prosecutors.

The leadership of an office is more than the direction of individual cases. It involves managing limited resources, maintaining high morale in the office, and building relationships with federal, state, and local law enforcement partners. When a U.S. Attorney submits his or her resignation, the Department must first determine who will serve temporarily as interim U.S. Attorney. The Department 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-appointed, Senate-confirmed United States Attorney. Often, the Department looks to the First Assistant U.S. Attorney or another senior manager in the office to serve as U.S. Attorney on

an interim basis. When neither the First Assistant nor another senior manager in the office is able or willing to serve as interim U.S. Attorney, or when the appointment of either would not be appropriate in the circumstances, the Department has looked to other, qualified Department employees. For example, in the District of Minnesota and the Northern District of Iowa, the First Assistant took federal retirement at or near the same time that the U.S. Attorney resigned, which required the Department to select another official to lead the office.

At no time, however, has the Administration sought to avoid the confirmation process in the Senate by appointing an interim U.S. Attorney and then refusing to move forward—in consultation with home-State Senators—on the selection, nomination, confirmation and appointment of a new U.S. Attorney. Not once. In every single case where a vacancy occurs, the Bush Administration is committed to having a United States Attorney who is confirmed by the Senate. And the Administration's actions bear this out. Every time a vacancy has arisen, the President has either made a nomination, or the Administration is working to select candidates for nomination. The appointment of U.S. Attorneys by and with the advice and consent of the Senate is unquestionably the appointment method preferred by the Senate, and it is unquestionably the appointment method preferred by the Administration.

Since January 20, 2001, 125 new U.S. Attorneys have been nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. On March 9, 2006, the Congress amended the Attorney General's authority to appoint interim U.S. Attorneys, and 16 vacancies have occurred since that date. This amendment has not changed our commitment to nominating candidates for Senate confirmation. In fact, the Administration has nominated a total of 15 individuals for Senate consideration since the appointment authority was amended, with 12 of those nominees having been confirmed to date. Of the 16 vacancies that have occurred since the time that the law

was amended, the Administration has nominated candidates to fill five of these positions, has interviewed candidates for nomination for seven more positions, and is waiting to receive names to set up interviews for the remaining positions—all in consultation with home-state Senators.

However, while that nomination process continues, the Department must have a leader in place to carry out the important work of these offices. To ensure an effective and smooth transition during U.S. Attorney vacancies, the office of the U.S. Attorney must be filled on an interim basis. To do so, the Department relies on the Vacancy Reform Act ("VRA"), 5 U.S.C. § 3345(a)(1), when the First Assistant is selected to lead the office, or the Attorney General's appointment authority in 28 U.S.C. § 546 when another Department employee is chosen. Under the VRA, the First Assistant may serve in an acting capacity for only 210 days, unless a nomination is made during that period. Under an Attorney General appointment, the interim U.S. Attorney serves until a nominee is confirmed the Senate. There is no other statutory authority for filling such a vacancy, and thus the use of the Attorney General's appointment authority, as amended last year, signals nothing other than a decision to have an interim U.S. Attorney who is not the First Assistant. It does not indicate an intention to avoid the confirmation process, as some have suggested.

H.R. 580 would supersede last year's amendment to 28 U.S.C. § 546 that authorized the Attorney General to appoint an interim U.S. Attorney to serve until a person fills the position by being confirmed by the Senate and appointed by the President. Last year's amendment was intended to ensure continuity of operations in the event of a U.S. Attorney vacancy that lasts longer than expected. H.R. 580 would institute a new appointment regime without allowing the Attorney General's authority under current law to be tested in practice.

Prior to last year's amendment, the Attorney General could appoint an interim U.S. Attorney for the first 120 days after a vacancy arose; thereafter, the district court was authorized to appoint an interim U.S. Attorney. In cases in which a Senate-confirmed U.S. Attorney could not be appointed within 120 days, the limitation on the Attorney General's appointment authority resulted in recurring problems. Some district courts recognized the conflicts inherent in the appointment of an interim U.S. Attorney who would then have matters before the court—not to mention the oddity of one branch of government appointing officers of another—and simply refused to exercise the appointment authority. In those cases, the Attorney General was consequently required to make multiple successive 120-day interim appointments. Other district courts ignored the inherent conflicts and sought to appoint as interim U.S. Attorneys wholly unacceptable candidates who lacked the required clearances or appropriate qualifications.

Two examples demonstrate the shortcomings of the previous system. During President Reagan's Administration, the district court appointed in the Southern District of West Virginia an interim U.S. Attorney who was neither a Justice Department employee nor a cleared individual. The new U.S. Attorney sought access to law-enforcement sensitive investigative materials related to the office's most sensitive public corruption investigation. The problem was that the interim U.S. Attorney had no clearances or had then undergone a background investigation so that the Attorney General and the Federal Bureau of Investigation could have complete confidence in the individual. The appointment forced the Department to remove the case files from the U.S. Attorney's office and bring them to Washington. In the end, the Department expedited the nomination of the permanent U.S. Attorney and appointed him to replace the court-appointed individual pending his confirmation.

In a second case, occurring in 2005, the district court appointed as interim U.S. Attorney in South

Dakota an individual who similarly was not a Department of Justice or federal employee and had never undergone the appropriate background check. As a result, the interim U.S. Attorney could have no access to classified information. The U.S. Attorney could not receive information from his district's anti-terrorism coordinator, its Joint Terrorism Task Force, or its Field Intelligence Group. In a post 9/11 world, this situation was unacceptable.

Despite these two notorious instances, in most cases, the district courts have simply appointed the Attorney General's choice as interim U.S. Attorney, revealing the fact that most judges have recognized the importance of appointing an interim U.S. Attorney who enjoys the confidence of the Attorney General. In other words, the most important factor in the selection of past court-appointed interim U.S. Attorneys was the Attorney General's recommendation. By foreclosing the possibility of judicial appointment of interim U.S. Attorneys unacceptable to the Administration, last year's amendment to Section 546 appropriately eliminated a procedure that created unnecessary problems without any apparent benefit.

The Department's principal objection to H.R. 580 is that it would be 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 under the circumstances described in the bill. We are aware of no other agency where federal judges—members of a separate branch of government—appoint on an interim basis senior, policymaking staff of an agency. Such a judicial appointee would have authority for litigating the entire federal criminal and civil docket before the very district court to whom he or she was beholden for the appointment. This arrangement, at a minimum, gives rise to an appearance of potential conflict that undermines the performance or perceived performance of both the Executive and Judicial Branches. A judge may be inclined to select a U.S. Attorney who shares the judge's ideological or prosecutorial philosophy. Or a judge

may select a prosecutor apt to settle cases and enter plea bargains, so as to preserve judicial resources. *See* Wiener, Inter-Branch Appointments After the Independent Counsel: Court Appointment of United States Attorneys, 86 Minn. L. Rev. 363, 428 (2001) (concluding that court appointment of interim U.S. Attorneys is unconstitutional).

Prosecutorial authority should be exercised by the Executive Branch in a unified manner, consistent with the application of criminal enforcement policy under the Attorney General. Court-appointed U.S. Attorneys would be at least as accountable to the chief judge of the district court as to the Attorney General, which could, in some circumstances become untenable. In no context is accountability more important to our society than on the front lines of law enforcement and the exercise of prosecutorial discretion, and the Department contends that the chief prosecutor should be accountable to the Attorney General, the President, and ultimately the people.

H.R. 580 appears to be aimed at addressing a problem that has not arisen. The Administration has repeatedly demonstrated its commitment to having a Senate-confirmed U.S. Attorney in every federal district. As noted, when a vacancy in the office of U.S. Attorney occurs, the Department typically looks first to the First Assistant or another senior manager in the office to serve as an acting or interim U.S. Attorney. Where neither the First Assistant nor another senior manager is able or willing to serve as an acting or interim U.S. Attorney, or where their service would not be appropriate under the circumstances, the Administration has looked to other Department employees to serve temporarily. No matter which way a U.S. Attorney is temporarily appointed, the Administration has consistently sought, and will continue to seek, to fill the vacancy—in consultation with home-State Senators—with a presidentially-nominated and Senate-confirmed nominee.

If, despite the fact that the Department does not believe a case has been made to repeal the current authority for appointing interim U.S. Attorneys, this Committee believes an amendment to section 546 is warranted, the Department would urge the Committee to reject H.R. 580.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify, and I look forward to answering the Committee's questions.

Silas, Adrien

From: Moschella, William
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2007 2:01 PM
To: Silas, Adrien; Goodling, Monica; Hertling, Richard
Cc: Scott-Finan, Nancy; Nowacki, John (USAEO)
Subject: Re: US Atty - ODAG Tstmny

As far as I am concerned it is ready.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: Silas, Adrien
To: Moschella, William; Goodling, Monica; Hertling, Richard
CC: Scott-Finan, Nancy; Nowacki, John (USAEO)
Sent: Fri Mar 02 13:23:08 2007
Subject: FW: US Atty - ODAG Tstmny

Just checking on status, as time is slipping away. Does anyone have further comments on the draft? Is it ready to go to OMB?

-----Original Message-----
From: Green, Richard E. [mailto:Richard_E._Green@omb.eop.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2007 1:13 PM
To: Silas, Adrien
Subject: RE: US Atty - ODAG Tstmny

What is happening with this one?

-----Original Message-----
From: Silas, Adrien [mailto:Adrien.Silas@usdoj.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2007 7:12 PM
To: Simms, Angela M.; Green, Richard E.
Subject: US Atty - ODAG Tstmny

HEADS UP: In the morning, we will be submitting testimony for a Tuesday House Judiciary hearing on the U.S. Attorneys. The statement will be substantially the previously cleared testimony for the Senate hearing, including language from the views letter on S. 214. The only new parts of the testimony are two examples of court appointments hindering law enforcement and our recommendations for improvement of the legislation.

Silas, Adrien

From: Scott-Finan, Nancy
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2007 2:45 PM
To: Scott-Finan, Nancy; Silas, Adrien
Cc: Hertling, Richard; Moschella, William; Goodling, Monica
Subject: RE: Moschella testimony

Hey, I screwed up and am making changes to the testimony and will recirculate. HR 580 returns to the old system, and does not take the AG out of the process entirely. I am editing the testimony right now.

From: Scott-Finan, Nancy
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2007 1:34 PM
To: Silas, Adrien
Cc: Hertling, Richard; Moschella, William; Goodling, Monica
Subject: FW: Moschella testimony

<< File: DRAFT Moschella Testimony2.doc >> Adrien, pls. forward this version to OMB for clearance and advise that this is substantially the same as our prior testimony and views letter, with an addition of examples where there were difficulties with court appointments. Also. Advise that the number on vacancies and nominations will change and will provide the new numbers once I have them. Thanks much.

Silas, Adrien

From: Scott-Finan, Nancy
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2007 3:06 PM
To: Hertling, Richard; Moschella, William; Goodling, Monica; Nowacki, John (USAEO)
Cc: Silas, Adrien
Subject: Revised Draft Testimony

I am attaching a revised version of the testimony saying that we have "significant concerns" about H.R. 580 and going with the suggested changes to make H.R. 580 acceptable to DOJ as I DID NOT CATCH AND TAKE FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR NOT CATCHING that this bill is a return to the old system--AG appointment for 120 days and then going to the court.. Pls. review before we send over to OMB

Silas, Adrien

From: Hertling, Richard
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2007 3:13 PM
To: Scott-Finan, Nancy; Moschella, William; Goodling, Monica; Nowacki, John (USAEO)
Cc: Silas, Adrien
Subject: Re: Revised Draft Testimony

Nothing attached.

-----Original Message-----
From: Scott-Finan, Nancy
To: Hertling, Richard; Moschella, William; Goodling, Monica; Nowacki, John (USAEO)
CC: Silas, Adrien
Sent: Fri Mar 02 15:06:20 2007
Subject: Revised Draft Testimony

I am attaching a revised version of the testimony saying that we have "significant concerns" about H.R. 580 and going with the suggested changes to make H.R. 580 acceptable to DOJ as I DID NOT CATCH AND TAKE FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR NOT CATCHING that this bill is a return to the old system--AG appointment for 120 days and then going to the court.. Pls. review before we send over to OMB

Silas, Adrien

From: Scott-Finan, Nancy
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2007 3:16 PM
To: Hertling, Richard; Moschella, William; Goodling, Monica; Nowacki, John (USAEO)
Cc: Silas, Adrien
Subject: RE: Revised Draft Testimony

Attachments: DRAFT Moschella Testimony3.wpd

DRAFT Moschella Testimony3.wpd...

-----Original Message-----
From: Hertling, Richard
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2007 3:13 PM
To: Scott-Finan, Nancy; Moschella, William; Goodling, Monica; Nowacki, John (USAEO)
Cc: Silas, Adrien
Subject: Re: Revised Draft Testimony

Nothing attached.

-----Original Message-----
From: Scott-Finan, Nancy
To: Hertling, Richard; Moschella, William; Goodling, Monica; Nowacki, John (USAEO)
CC: Silas, Adrien
Sent: Fri Mar 02 15:06:20 2007
Subject: Revised Draft Testimony

I am attaching a revised version of the testimony saying that we have "significant concerns" about H.R. 580 and going with the suggested changes to make H.R. 580 acceptable to DOJ as I DID NOT CATCH AND TAKE FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR NOT CATCHING that this bill is a return to the old system--AG appointment for 120 days and then going to the court.. Pls. review before we send over to OMB

Department of Justice

STATEMENT

OF

WILLIAM E. MOSCHELLA
PRINCIPAL ASSOCIATE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

CONCERNING

"H.R. 580, RESTORING CHECKS AND BALANCES IN THE NOMINATION PROCESS OF U.S. ATTORNEYS"

PRESENTED ON

MARCH 6, 2007

Testimony
of

William E. Moschella
Principal Associate Deputy Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice

Committee on the Judiciary
United States House of Representatives

"H.R. 580, Restoring Checks and Balances in the Nomination Process of U.S. Attorneys"

March 6, 2007

Chairman Conyers, Congressman Smith, and members of the Committee, thank you for the invitation to discuss the importance of the Justice Department's United States Attorneys.

The Department of Justice has significant concerns about H.R. 580, the "Preserving United States Attorneys Independence Act of 2007" as set forth herein.

As the chief federal law-enforcement officers in their districts, our 93 U.S. Attorneys represent the Attorney General and the Department of Justice throughout the United States. U.S. Attorneys are not just prosecutors; they are government officials charged with managing and implementing the policies and priorities of the President and the Attorney General. The Attorney General has set forth key priorities for the Department of Justice, and in each of their districts, U.S. Attorneys lead the Department's efforts to protect America from terrorist attacks and fight violent crime, combat illegal drug trafficking, ensure the integrity of government and

the marketplace, enforce our immigration laws, and prosecute crimes that endanger children and families—including child pornography, obscenity, and human trafficking.

United States Attorneys serve at the pleasure of the President. Like any other high-ranking officials in the Executive Branch, they may be removed for any reason or no reason. The Department of Justice—including the office of United States Attorney—was created precisely so that the government's legal business could be effectively managed and carried out through a coherent program under the supervision of the Attorney General. Unlike judges, who are supposed to act independently of those who nominate them, U.S. Attorneys are accountable to the Attorney General, and through him, to the President—the head of the Executive Branch. This accountability ensures compliance with Department policy, and is often recognized by the Members of Congress who write to the Department to encourage various U.S. Attorneys' Offices to focus on a particular area of law enforcement.

The Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General are responsible for evaluating the performance of the United States Attorneys and ensuring that they are leading their offices effectively. It should come as no surprise to anyone that, in an organization as large as the Justice Department, U.S. Attorneys are removed or asked or encouraged to resign from time to time. However, in this Administration U.S. Attorneys are never—repeat, 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. Any suggestion to the contrary is unfounded, and it irresponsibly undermines the reputation for impartiality the Department has earned over many years and on which it depends.

Turnover in the position of U.S. Attorney is not uncommon and should be expected, particularly after a U.S. Attorney's four-year term has expired. When a presidential election results in a change of administration, every U.S. Attorney leaves and the new President nominates a successor for confirmation by the Senate. Moreover, U.S. Attorneys do not necessarily stay in place even during an administration. For example, approximately half of the U.S. Attorneys appointed at the beginning of the Bush Administration had left office by the end of 2006. Of the U.S. Attorneys whose resignations have been the subject of recent discussion, each one had served longer than four years prior to being asked to resign.

Given the reality of turnover among the United States Attorneys, our system depends heavily on the dedicated service of the career investigators and prosecutors. While a new U.S. Attorney may articulate new priorities or emphasize different types of cases, the effect of a U.S. Attorney's departure on an existing investigation is, in fact, minimal, and that is as it should be. The career civil servants who prosecute federal criminal cases are dedicated professionals and an effective U.S. Attorney relies on the professional judgment of those prosecutors.

The leadership of an office is more than the direction of individual cases. It involves managing limited resources, maintaining high morale in the office, and building relationships with federal, state, and local law enforcement partners. When a U.S. Attorney submits his or her resignation, the Department must first determine who will serve temporarily as interim U.S. Attorney. The Department 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-appointed, Senate-confirmed United States Attorney. Often, the Department looks

to the First Assistant U.S. Attorney or another senior manager in the office to serve as U.S. Attorney on an interim basis. When neither the First Assistant nor another senior manager in the office is able or willing to serve as interim U.S. Attorney, or when the appointment of either would not be appropriate in the circumstances, the Department has looked to other, qualified Department employees. For example, in the District of Minnesota and the Northern District of Iowa, the First Assistant took federal retirement at or near the same time that the U.S. Attorney resigned, which required the Department to select another official to lead the office.

At no time, however, has the Administration sought to avoid the confirmation process in the Senate by appointing an interim U.S. Attorney and then refusing to move forward—in consultation with home-State Senators—on the selection, nomination, confirmation and appointment of a new U.S. Attorney. Not once. In every single case where a vacancy occurs, the Bush Administration is committed to having a United States Attorney who is confirmed by the Senate. And the Administration's actions bear this out. Every time a vacancy has arisen, the President has either made a nomination, or the Administration is working to select candidates for nomination. The appointment of U.S. Attorneys by and with the advice and consent of the Senate is unquestionably the appointment method preferred by the Senate, and it is unquestionably the appointment method preferred by the Administration.

Since January 20, 2001, 125 new U.S. Attorneys have been nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. On March 9, 2006, the Congress amended the Attorney General's authority to appoint interim U.S. Attorneys, and 16 vacancies have occurred since that date. This amendment has not changed our commitment to nominating candidates for Senate

confirmation. In fact, the Administration has nominated a total of 15 individuals for Senate consideration since the appointment authority was amended, with 12 of those nominees having been confirmed to date. Of the 16 vacancies that have occurred since the time that the law was amended, the Administration has nominated candidates to fill five of these positions, has interviewed candidates for nomination for seven more positions, and is waiting to receive names to set up interviews for the remaining positions—all in consultation with home-state Senators.

However, while that nomination process continues, the Department must have a leader in place to carry out the important work of these offices. To ensure an effective and smooth transition during U.S. Attorney vacancies, the office of the U.S. Attorney must be filled on an interim basis. To do so, the Department relies on the Vacancy Reform Act ("VRA"), 5 U.S.C. § 3345(a)(1), when the First Assistant is selected to lead the office, or the Attorney General's appointment authority in 28 U.S.C. § 546 when another Department employee is chosen. Under the VRA, the First Assistant may serve in an acting capacity for only 210 days, unless a nomination is made during that period. Under an Attorney General appointment, the interim U.S. Attorney serves until a nominee is confirmed the Senate. There is no other statutory authority for filling such a vacancy, and thus the use of the Attorney General's appointment authority, as amended last year, signals nothing other than a decision to have an interim U.S. Attorney who is not the First Assistant. It does not indicate an intention to avoid the confirmation process, as some have suggested.

H.R. 580 would supersede last year's amendment to 28 U.S.C. § 546 that authorized the Attorney General to appoint an interim U.S. Attorney to serve until a person fills the position by

being confirmed by the Senate and appointed by the President. Last year's amendment was intended to ensure continuity of operations in the event of a U.S. Attorney vacancy that lasts longer than expected. H.R. 580 would not permit the Attorney General's authority under current law to be tested in practice.

Prior to last year's amendment, the Attorney General could appoint an interim U.S. Attorney for the first 120 days after a vacancy arose; thereafter, the district court was authorized to appoint an interim U.S. Attorney. In cases in which a Senate-confirmed U.S. Attorney could not be appointed within 120 days, the limitation on the Attorney General's appointment authority resulted in recurring problems. Some district courts recognized the conflicts inherent in the appointment of an interim U.S. Attorney who would then have matters before the court—not to mention the oddity of one branch of government appointing officers of another—and simply refused to exercise the appointment authority. In those cases, the Attorney General was consequently required to make multiple successive 120-day interim appointments. Other district courts ignored the inherent conflicts and sought to appoint as interim U.S. Attorneys wholly unacceptable candidates who lacked the required clearances or appropriate qualifications.

Two examples demonstrate the shortcomings of the previous system. During President Reagan's Administration, the district court appointed in the Southern District of West Virginia an interim U.S. Attorney who was neither a Justice Department employee nor a cleared individual. The new U.S. Attorney sought access to law-enforcement sensitive investigative materials related to the office's most sensitive public corruption investigation. The problem was

that the interim U.S. Attorney had no clearances or had then undergone a background investigation so that the Attorney General and the Federal Bureau of Investigation could have complete confidence in the individual. The appointment forced the Department to remove the case files from the U.S. Attorney's office and bring them to Washington. In the end, the Department expedited the nomination of the permanent U.S. Attorney and appointed him to replace the court-appointed individual pending his confirmation.

In a second case, occurring in 2005, the district court appointed as interim U.S. Attorney in South Dakota an individual who similarly was not a Department of Justice or federal employee and had never undergone the appropriate background check. As a result, the interim U.S. Attorney could have no access to classified information. The U.S. Attorney could not receive information from his district's anti-terrorism coordinator, its Joint Terrorism Task Force, or its Field Intelligence Group. In a post 9/11 world, this situation was unacceptable.

Despite these two notorious instances, in most cases, the district courts have simply appointed the Attorney General's choice as interim U.S. Attorney, revealing the fact that most judges have recognized the importance of appointing an interim U.S. Attorney who enjoys the confidence of the Attorney General. In other words, the most important factor in the selection of past court-appointed interim U.S. Attorneys was the Attorney General's recommendation. By foreclosing the possibility of judicial appointment of interim U.S. Attorneys unacceptable to the Administration, last year's amendment to Section 546 appropriately eliminated a procedure that created unnecessary problems without any apparent benefit.

The Department's principal objection to H.R. 580 is that it would be 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. We are aware of no other agency where federal judges—members of a separate branch of government—appoint on an interim basis senior, policymaking staff of an agency. Such a judicial appointee would have authority for litigating the entire federal criminal and civil docket before the very district court to whom he or she was beholden for the appointment. This arrangement, at a minimum, gives rise to an appearance of potential conflict that undermines the performance or perceived performance of both the Executive and Judicial Branches. A judge may be inclined to select a U.S. Attorney who shares the judge's ideological or prosecutorial philosophy. Or a judge may select a prosecutor apt to settle cases and enter plea bargains, so as to preserve judicial resources. *See* Wiener, Inter-Branch Appointments After the Independent Counsel: Court Appointment of United States Attorneys, 86 Minn. L. Rev. 363, 428 (2001) (concluding that court appointment of interim U.S. Attorneys is unconstitutional).

Prosecutorial authority should be exercised by the Executive Branch in a unified manner, consistent with the application of criminal enforcement policy under the Attorney General. Court-appointed U.S. Attorneys would be at least as accountable to the chief judge of the district court as to the Attorney General, which could, in some circumstances become untenable. In no context is accountability more important to our society than on the front lines of law enforcement and the exercise of prosecutorial discretion, and the Department contends that the chief prosecutor should be accountable to the Attorney General, the President, and ultimately the people.

H.R. 580 appears to be aimed at addressing a problem that has not arisen. The Administration has repeatedly demonstrated its commitment to having a Senate-confirmed U.S. Attorney in every federal district. As noted, when a vacancy in the office of U.S. Attorney occurs, the Department typically looks first to the First Assistant or another senior manager in the office to serve as an acting or interim U.S. Attorney. Where neither the First Assistant nor another senior manager is able or willing to serve as an acting or interim U.S. Attorney, or where their service would not be appropriate under the circumstances, the Administration has looked to other Department employees to serve temporarily. No matter which way a U.S. Attorney is temporarily appointed, the Administration has consistently sought, and will continue to seek, to fill the vacancy—in consultation with home-State Senators—with a presidentially-nominated and Senate-confirmed nominee.

If, despite the fact that the Department does not believe a case has been made to repeal the current authority for appointing interim U.S. Attorneys, this Committee believes an amendment to section 546 is warranted, the Department would urge the Committee to consider the following suggestions: First, the 120-day period in the prior statute proved to be far too short. Congress has itself determined in the Vacancies Reform Act that 210 days is a more appropriate length of time to permit an official already with an agency to serve in an acting capacity in an office subject to Senate confirmation. We urge that, if the Committee wishes to restore some authority to the district courts to appoint interim U.S. Attorneys, it confer this authority on the district court only after 210 days have elapsed on the Attorney General's appointment, and not the 120 days in the former statute. The reality is that between the selection of U.S. Attorneys and the confirmation process in the Senate, it now takes an average of more

than 300 days to fill an open U.S. Attorney position with a confirmed individual. Second, to avoid problematic cases such as the two noted above, we request that the law permit the district to appoint as interim U.S. Attorney only an individual who is a current Justice Department employee or has been cleared for or eligible to obtain a clearance for access to classified information. Finally, we request that the law contain a requirement that the district court consult with the Attorney General prior to making the appointment. This last requirement will permit the Attorney General to advise the district court on whether the individual has been cleared or is qualified to receive a security clearance and whether the individual, if he or she is a current Justice Department employee, is the subject of an investigation by the Office of Professional Responsibility or the Inspector General. If H.R. 580 were amended to include these provisions, the Department would not interpose an objection to the legislation.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify, and I look forward to answering the Committee's questions.

Silas, Adrien

From: Scott-Finan, Nancy
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2007 5:20 PM
To: Moschella, William; Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Cc: Silas, Adrien
Subject: HR 580

Attachments: DRAFT Moschella Testimony3.wpd

I changed the opening paragraph. I know everyone has been very busy this afternoon. Please review before we send to

DRAFT Moschella Testimony3.wpd...

OMB. Thanks much.

Department of Justice

STATEMENT

OF

WILLIAM E. MOSCHELLA
PRINCIPAL ASSOCIATE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

CONCERNING

"H.R. 580, RESTORING CHECKS AND BALANCES IN THE NOMINATION PROCESS OF U.S. ATTORNEYS"

PRESENTED ON

MARCH 6, 2007

Testimony
of

William E. Moschella
Principal Associate Deputy Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice

Committee on the Judiciary
United States House of Representatives

"H.R. 580, Restoring Checks and Balances in the Nomination Process of U.S. Attorneys"

March 6, 2007

Chairman Conyers, Congressman Smith, and members of the Committee, thank you for the invitation to discuss the importance of the Justice Department's United States Attorneys.

The Department of Justice opposes H.R. 580, the "Preserving United States Attorneys Independence Act of 2007" as presently drafted for the reasons set forth herein.

As the chief federal law-enforcement officers in their districts, our 93 U.S. Attorneys represent the Attorney General and the Department of Justice throughout the United States. U.S. Attorneys are not just prosecutors; they are government officials charged with managing and implementing the policies and priorities of the President and the Attorney General. The Attorney General has set forth key priorities for the Department of Justice, and in each of their districts, U.S. Attorneys lead the Department's efforts to protect America from terrorist attacks and fight violent crime, combat illegal drug trafficking, ensure the integrity of government and

the marketplace, enforce our immigration laws, and prosecute crimes that endanger children and families—including child pornography, obscenity, and human trafficking.

United States Attorneys serve at the pleasure of the President. Like any other high-ranking officials in the Executive Branch, they may be removed for any reason or no reason. The Department of Justice—including the office of United States Attorney—was created precisely so that the government's legal business could be effectively managed and carried out through a coherent program under the supervision of the Attorney General. Unlike judges, who are supposed to act independently of those who nominate them, U.S. Attorneys are accountable to the Attorney General, and through him, to the President—the head of the Executive Branch. This accountability ensures compliance with Department policy, and is often recognized by the Members of Congress who write to the Department to encourage various U.S. Attorneys' Offices to focus on a particular area of law enforcement.

The Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General are responsible for evaluating the performance of the United States Attorneys and ensuring that they are leading their offices effectively. It should come as no surprise to anyone that, in an organization as large as the Justice Department, U.S. Attorneys are removed or asked or encouraged to resign from time to time. However, in this Administration U.S. Attorneys are never—repeat, 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. Any suggestion to the contrary is unfounded, and it irresponsibly undermines the reputation for impartiality the Department has earned over many years and on which it depends.

Turnover in the position of U.S. Attorney is not uncommon and should be expected, particularly after a U.S. Attorney's four-year term has expired. When a presidential election results in a change of administration, every U.S. Attorney leaves and the new President nominates a successor for confirmation by the Senate. Moreover, U.S. Attorneys do not necessarily stay in place even during an administration. For example, approximately half of the U.S. Attorneys appointed at the beginning of the Bush Administration had left office by the end of 2006. Of the U.S. Attorneys whose resignations have been the subject of recent discussion, each one had served longer than four years prior to being asked to resign.

Given the reality of turnover among the United States Attorneys, our system depends heavily on the dedicated service of the career investigators and prosecutors. While a new U.S. Attorney may articulate new priorities or emphasize different types of cases, the effect of a U.S. Attorney's departure on an existing investigation is, in fact, minimal, and that is as it should be. The career civil servants who prosecute federal criminal cases are dedicated professionals and an effective U.S. Attorney relies on the professional judgment of those prosecutors.

The leadership of an office is more than the direction of individual cases. It involves managing limited resources, maintaining high morale in the office, and building relationships with federal, state, and local law enforcement partners. When a U.S. Attorney submits his or her resignation, the Department must first determine who will serve temporarily as interim U.S. Attorney. The Department 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-appointed, Senate-confirmed United States Attorney. Often, the Department looks

to the First Assistant U.S. Attorney or another senior manager in the office to serve as U.S. Attorney on an interim basis. When neither the First Assistant nor another senior manager in the office is able or willing to serve as interim U.S. Attorney, or when the appointment of either would not be appropriate in the circumstances, the Department has looked to other, qualified Department employees. For example, in the District of Minnesota and the Northern District of Iowa, the First Assistant took federal retirement at or near the same time that the U.S. Attorney resigned, which required the Department to select another official to lead the office.

At no time, however, has the Administration sought to avoid the confirmation process in the Senate by appointing an interim U.S. Attorney and then refusing to move forward—in consultation with home-State Senators—on the selection, nomination, confirmation and appointment of a new U.S. Attorney. Not once. In every single case where a vacancy occurs, the Bush Administration is committed to having a United States Attorney who is confirmed by the Senate. And the Administration's actions bear this out. Every time a vacancy has arisen, the President has either made a nomination, or the Administration is working to select candidates for nomination. The appointment of U.S. Attorneys by and with the advice and consent of the Senate is unquestionably the appointment method preferred by the Senate, and it is unquestionably the appointment method preferred by the Administration.

Since January 20, 2001, 125 new U.S. Attorneys have been nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. On March 9, 2006, the Congress amended the Attorney General's authority to appoint interim U.S. Attorneys, and 16 vacancies have occurred since that date. This amendment has not changed our commitment to nominating candidates for Senate

confirmation. In fact, the Administration has nominated a total of 15 individuals for Senate consideration since the appointment authority was amended, with 12 of those nominees having been confirmed to date. Of the 16 vacancies that have occurred since the time that the law was amended, the Administration has nominated candidates to fill five of these positions, has interviewed candidates for nomination for seven more positions, and is waiting to receive names to set up interviews for the remaining positions—all in consultation with home-state Senators.

However, while that nomination process continues, the Department must have a leader in place to carry out the important work of these offices. To ensure an effective and smooth transition during U.S. Attorney vacancies, the office of the U.S. Attorney must be filled on an interim basis. To do so, the Department relies on the Vacancy Reform Act ("VRA"), 5 U.S.C. § 3345(a)(1), when the First Assistant is selected to lead the office, or the Attorney General's appointment authority in 28 U.S.C. § 546 when another Department employee is chosen. Under the VRA, the First Assistant may serve in an acting capacity for only 210 days, unless a nomination is made during that period. Under an Attorney General appointment, the interim U.S. Attorney serves until a nominee is confirmed the Senate. There is no other statutory authority for filling such a vacancy, and thus the use of the Attorney General's appointment authority, as amended last year, signals nothing other than a decision to have an interim U.S. Attorney who is not the First Assistant. It does not indicate an intention to avoid the confirmation process, as some have suggested.

H.R. 580 would supersede last year's amendment to 28 U.S.C. § 546 that authorized the Attorney General to appoint an interim U.S. Attorney to serve until a person fills the position by

being confirmed by the Senate and appointed by the President. Last year's amendment was intended to ensure continuity of operations in the event of a U.S. Attorney vacancy that lasts longer than expected. H.R. 580 would not permit the Attorney General's authority under current law to be tested in practice.

Prior to last year's amendment, the Attorney General could appoint an interim U.S. Attorney for the first 120 days after a vacancy arose; thereafter, the district court was authorized to appoint an interim U.S. Attorney. In cases in which a Senate-confirmed U.S. Attorney could not be appointed within 120 days, the limitation on the Attorney General's appointment authority resulted in recurring problems. Some district courts recognized the conflicts inherent in the appointment of an interim U.S. Attorney who would then have matters before the court—not to mention the oddity of one branch of government appointing officers of another—and simply refused to exercise the appointment authority. In those cases, the Attorney General was consequently required to make multiple successive 120-day interim appointments. Other district courts ignored the inherent conflicts and sought to appoint as interim U.S. Attorneys wholly unacceptable candidates who lacked the required clearances or appropriate qualifications.

Two examples demonstrate the shortcomings of the previous system. During President Reagan's Administration, the district court appointed in the Southern District of West Virginia an interim U.S. Attorney who was neither a Justice Department employee nor a cleared individual. The new U.S. Attorney sought access to law-enforcement sensitive investigative materials related to the office's most sensitive public corruption investigation. The problem was

that the interim U.S. Attorney had no clearances or had then undergone a background investigation so that the Attorney General and the Federal Bureau of Investigation could have complete confidence in the individual. The appointment forced the Department to remove the case files from the U.S. Attorney's office and bring them to Washington. In the end, the Department expedited the nomination of the permanent U.S. Attorney and appointed him to replace the court-appointed individual pending his confirmation.

In a second case, occurring in 2005, the district court appointed as interim U.S. Attorney in South Dakota an individual who similarly was not a Department of Justice or federal employee and had never undergone the appropriate background check. As a result, the interim U.S. Attorney could have no access to classified information. The U.S. Attorney could not receive information from his district's anti-terrorism coordinator, its Joint Terrorism Task Force, or its Field Intelligence Group. In a post 9/11 world, this situation was unacceptable.

Despite these two notorious instances, in most cases, the district courts have simply appointed the Attorney General's choice as interim U.S. Attorney, revealing the fact that most judges have recognized the importance of appointing an interim U.S. Attorney who enjoys the confidence of the Attorney General. In other words, the most important factor in the selection of past court-appointed interim U.S. Attorneys was the Attorney General's recommendation. By foreclosing the possibility of judicial appointment of interim U.S. Attorneys unacceptable to the Administration, last year's amendment to Section 546 appropriately eliminated a procedure that created unnecessary problems without any apparent benefit.

The Department's principal objection to H.R. 580 is that it would be 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. We are aware of no other agency where federal judges—members of a separate branch of government—appoint on an interim basis senior, policymaking staff of an agency. Such a judicial appointee would have authority for litigating the entire federal criminal and civil docket before the very district court to whom he or she was beholden for the appointment. This arrangement, at a minimum, gives rise to an appearance of potential conflict that undermines the performance or perceived performance of both the Executive and Judicial Branches. A judge may be inclined to select a U.S. Attorney who shares the judge's ideological or prosecutorial philosophy. Or a judge may select a prosecutor apt to settle cases and enter plea bargains, so as to preserve judicial resources. *See* Wiener, Inter-Branch Appointments After the Independent Counsel: Court Appointment of United States Attorneys, 86 Minn. L. Rev. 363, 428 (2001) (concluding that court appointment of interim U.S. Attorneys is unconstitutional).

Prosecutorial authority should be exercised by the Executive Branch in a unified manner, consistent with the application of criminal enforcement policy under the Attorney General. Court-appointed U.S. Attorneys would be at least as accountable to the chief judge of the district court as to the Attorney General, which could, in some circumstances become untenable. In no context is accountability more important to our society than on the front lines of law enforcement and the exercise of prosecutorial discretion, and the Department contends that the chief prosecutor should be accountable to the Attorney General, the President, and ultimately the people.

H.R. 580 appears to be aimed at addressing a problem that has not arisen. The Administration has repeatedly demonstrated its commitment to having a Senate-confirmed U.S. Attorney in every federal district. As noted, when a vacancy in the office of U.S. Attorney occurs, the Department typically looks first to the First Assistant or another senior manager in the office to serve as an acting or interim U.S. Attorney. Where neither the First Assistant nor another senior manager is able or willing to serve as an acting or interim U.S. Attorney, or where their service would not be appropriate under the circumstances, the Administration has looked to other Department employees to serve temporarily. No matter which way a U.S. Attorney is temporarily appointed, the Administration has consistently sought, and will continue to seek, to fill the vacancy—in consultation with home-State Senators—with a presidentially-nominated and Senate-confirmed nominee.

If, despite the fact that the Department does not believe a case has been made to repeal the current authority for appointing interim U.S. Attorneys, this Committee believes an amendment to section 546 is warranted, the Department would urge the Committee to consider the following suggestions: First, the 120-day period in the prior statute proved to be far too short. Congress has itself determined in the Vacancies Reform Act that 210 days is a more appropriate length of time to permit an official already with an agency to serve in an acting capacity in an office subject to Senate confirmation. We urge that, if the Committee wishes to restore some authority to the district courts to appoint interim U.S. Attorneys, it confer this authority on the district court only after 210 days have elapsed on the Attorney General's appointment, and not the 120 days in the former statute. The reality is that between the selection of U.S. Attorneys and the confirmation process in the Senate, it now takes an average of more

than 300 days to fill an open U.S. Attorney position with a confirmed individual. Second, to avoid problematic cases such as the two noted above, we request that the law permit the district to appoint as interim U.S. Attorney only an individual who is a current Justice Department employee or has been cleared for or eligible to obtain a clearance for access to classified information. Finally, we request that the law contain a requirement that the district court consult with the Attorney General prior to making the appointment. This last requirement will permit the Attorney General to advise the district court on whether the individual has been cleared or is qualified to receive a security clearance and whether the individual, if he or she is a current Justice Department employee, is the subject of an investigation by the Office of Professional Responsibility or the Inspector General. If H.R. 580 were amended to include these provisions, the Department would not interpose an objection to the legislation.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify, and I look forward to answering the Committee's questions.

Silas, Adrien

From: Silas, Adrien
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2007 6:03 PM
To: 'Simms, Angela M.'; 'Richard_E._Green@omb.eop.gov'
Subject: US Atty - ODAG Tstmny

Attachments: USAttys01.doc.doc

The revised statement is attached. We apologize for the delay.

USAttys01.doc.doc
(79 KB)

Department of Justice

STATEMENT

OF

WILLIAM E. MOSCHELLA
PRINCIPAL ASSOCIATE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

CONCERNING

"H.R. 580, RESTORING CHECKS AND BALANCES IN THE NOMINATION PROCESS OF U.S. ATTORNEYS"

PRESENTED ON

MARCH 6, 2007

Testimony
of

William E. Moschella
Principal Associate Deputy Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice

Committee on the Judiciary
United States House of Representatives

"H.R. 580, Restoring Checks and Balances in the Nomination Process of U.S. Attorneys"

March 6, 2007

Chairman Conyers, Congressman Smith, and members of the Committee, thank you for the invitation to discuss the importance of the Justice Department's United States Attorneys.

The Department of Justice opposes H.R. 580, the "Preserving United States Attorneys Independence Act of 2007" as presently drafted for the reasons set forth herein.

As the chief federal law-enforcement officers in their districts, our 93 U.S. Attorneys represent the Attorney General and the Department of Justice throughout the United States. U.S. Attorneys are not just prosecutors; they are government officials charged with managing and implementing the policies and priorities of the President and the Attorney General. The Attorney General has set forth key priorities for the Department of Justice, and in each of their districts, U.S. Attorneys lead the Department's efforts to protect America from terrorist attacks and fight violent crime, combat illegal drug trafficking, ensure the integrity of government and the marketplace, enforce our immigration laws, and prosecute crimes that endanger children and families—including child pornography, obscenity, and human trafficking.

United States Attorneys serve at the pleasure of the President. Like any other high-ranking officials in the Executive Branch, they may be removed for any reason or no reason. The Department of Justice—including the office of United States Attorney—was created precisely so that the government's legal business could be effectively managed and carried out through a coherent program under the supervision of the Attorney General. Unlike judges, who are supposed to act independently of those who nominate them, U.S. Attorneys are accountable to the Attorney General, and through him, to the President—the head of the Executive Branch. This accountability ensures compliance with Department policy, and is often recognized by the Members of Congress who write to the Department to encourage various U.S. Attorneys' Offices to focus on a particular area of law enforcement.

The Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General are responsible for evaluating the performance of the United States Attorneys and ensuring that they are leading their offices effectively. It should come as no surprise to anyone that, in an organization as large as the Justice Department, U.S. Attorneys are removed or asked or encouraged to resign from time to time. However, in this Administration U.S. Attorneys are never—repeat, 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. Any suggestion to the contrary is unfounded, and it irresponsibly undermines the reputation for impartiality the Department has earned over many years and on which it depends.

Turnover in the position of U.S. Attorney is not uncommon and should be expected, particularly after a U.S. Attorney's four-year term has expired. When a presidential election results in a change of administration, every U.S. Attorney leaves and the new President nominates a successor for confirmation by the Senate. Moreover, U.S. Attorneys do not

necessarily stay in place even during an administration. For example, approximately half of the U.S. Attorneys appointed at the beginning of the Bush Administration had left office by the end of 2006. Of the U.S. Attorneys whose resignations have been the subject of recent discussion, each one had served longer than four years prior to being asked to resign.

Given the reality of turnover among the United States Attorneys, our system depends heavily on the dedicated service of the career investigators and prosecutors. While a new U.S. Attorney may articulate new priorities or emphasize different types of cases, the effect of a U.S. Attorney's departure on an existing investigation is, in fact, minimal, and that is as it should be. The career civil servants who prosecute federal criminal cases are dedicated professionals and an effective U.S. Attorney relies on the professional judgment of those prosecutors.

The leadership of an office is more than the direction of individual cases. It involves managing limited resources, maintaining high morale in the office, and building relationships with federal, state, and local law enforcement partners. When a U.S. Attorney submits his or her resignation, the Department must first determine who will serve temporarily as interim U.S. Attorney. The Department 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-appointed, Senate-confirmed United States Attorney. Often, the Department looks to the First Assistant U.S. Attorney or another senior manager in the office to serve as U.S. Attorney on an interim basis. When neither the First Assistant nor another senior manager in the office is able or willing to serve as interim U.S. Attorney, or when the appointment of either would not be appropriate in the circumstances, the Department has looked to other, qualified Department employees. For example, in the District of Minnesota and the Northern District of Iowa, the First Assistant took federal retirement at or near the same time that the U.S. Attorney resigned, which required the Department to select another official to lead the office.

At no time, however, has the Administration sought to avoid the confirmation process in the Senate by appointing an interim U.S. Attorney and then refusing to move forward—in consultation with home-State Senators—on the selection, nomination, confirmation and appointment of a new U.S. Attorney. Not once. In every single case where a vacancy occurs, the Bush Administration is committed to having a United States Attorney who is confirmed by the Senate. And the Administration's actions bear this out. Every time a vacancy has arisen, the President has either made a nomination, or the Administration is working to select candidates for nomination. The appointment of U.S. Attorneys by and with the advice and consent of the Senate is unquestionably the appointment method preferred by the Senate, and it is unquestionably the appointment method preferred by the Administration.

Since January 20, 2001, 125 new U.S. Attorneys have been nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. On March 9, 2006, the Congress amended the Attorney General's authority to appoint interim U.S. Attorneys, and 16 vacancies have occurred since that date. This amendment has not changed our commitment to nominating candidates for Senate confirmation. In fact, the Administration has nominated a total of 15 individuals for Senate consideration since the appointment authority was amended, with 12 of those nominees having been confirmed to date. Of the 16 vacancies that have occurred since the time that the law was amended, the Administration has nominated candidates to fill five of these positions, has interviewed candidates for nomination for seven more positions, and is waiting to receive names to set up interviews for the remaining positions—all in consultation with home-state Senators.

However, while that nomination process continues, the Department must have a leader in place to carry out the important work of these offices. To ensure an effective and smooth transition during U.S. Attorney vacancies, the office of the U.S. Attorney must be filled on an

interim basis. To do so, the Department relies on the Vacancy Reform Act ("VRA"), 5 U.S.C. § 3345(a)(1), when the First Assistant is selected to lead the office, or the Attorney General's appointment authority in 28 U.S.C. § 546 when another Department employee is chosen. Under the VRA, the First Assistant may serve in an acting capacity for only 210 days, unless a nomination is made during that period. Under an Attorney General appointment, the interim U.S. Attorney serves until a nominee is confirmed the Senate. There is no other statutory authority for filling such a vacancy, and thus the use of the Attorney General's appointment authority, as amended last year, signals nothing other than a decision to have an interim U.S. Attorney who is not the First Assistant. It does not indicate an intention to avoid the confirmation process, as some have suggested.

H.R. 580 would supersede last year's amendment to 28 U.S.C. § 546 that authorized the Attorney General to appoint an interim U.S. Attorney to serve until a person fills the position by being confirmed by the Senate and appointed by the President. Last year's amendment was intended to ensure continuity of operations in the event of a U.S. Attorney vacancy that lasts longer than expected. H.R. 580 would not permit the Attorney General's authority under current law to be tested in practice.

Prior to last year's amendment, the Attorney General could appoint an interim U.S. Attorney for the first 120 days after a vacancy arose; thereafter, the district court was authorized to appoint an interim U.S. Attorney. In cases in which a Senate-confirmed U.S. Attorney could not be appointed within 120 days, the limitation on the Attorney General's appointment authority resulted in recurring problems. Some district courts recognized the conflicts inherent in the appointment of an interim U.S. Attorney who would then have matters before the court—not to mention the oddity of one branch of government appointing officers of another—and simply refused to exercise the appointment authority. In those cases, the Attorney General was

consequently required to make multiple successive 120-day interim appointments. Other district courts ignored the inherent conflicts and sought to appoint as interim U.S. Attorneys wholly unacceptable candidates who lacked the required clearances or appropriate qualifications.

Two examples demonstrate the shortcomings of the previous system and the system contemplated in H.R. 580. During President Reagan's Administration, the district court appointed in the Southern District of West Virginia an interim U.S. Attorney who was neither a Justice Department employee nor a cleared individual. The new U.S. Attorney sought access to law-enforcement sensitive investigative materials related to the office's most sensitive public corruption investigation. The problem was that the interim U.S. Attorney had no clearances or had then undergone a background investigation so that the Attorney General and the Federal Bureau of Investigation could have complete confidence in the individual. The appointment forced the Department to remove the case files from the U.S. Attorney's office and bring them to Washington. In the end, the Department expedited the nomination of the permanent U.S. Attorney and appointed him to replace the court-appointed individual pending his confirmation.

In a second case, occurring in 2005, the district court appointed as interim U.S. Attorney in South Dakota an individual who similarly was not a Department of Justice or federal employee and had never undergone the appropriate background check. As a result, the interim U.S. Attorney could have no access to classified information. The U.S. Attorney could not receive information from his district's anti-terrorism coordinator, its Joint Terrorism Task Force, or its Field Intelligence Group. In a post 9/11 world, this situation was unacceptable.

Despite these two notorious instances, in most cases, the district courts have simply appointed the Attorney General's choice as interim U.S. Attorney, revealing the fact that most judges have recognized the importance of appointing an interim U.S. Attorney who enjoys the

confidence of the Attorney General. In other words, the most important factor in the selection of past court-appointed interim U.S. Attorneys was the Attorney General's recommendation. By foreclosing the possibility of judicial appointment of interim U.S. Attorneys unacceptable to the Administration, last year's amendment to Section 546 appropriately eliminated a procedure that created unnecessary problems without any apparent benefit.

The Department's principal objection to H.R. 580 is that it would be 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. We are aware of no other agency where federal judges—members of a separate branch of government—appoint on an interim basis senior, policymaking staff of an agency. Such a judicial appointee would have authority for litigating the entire federal criminal and civil docket before the very district court to whom he or she was beholden for the appointment. This arrangement, at a minimum, gives rise to an appearance of potential conflict that undermines the performance or perceived performance of both the Executive and Judicial Branches. A judge may be inclined to select a U.S. Attorney who shares the judge's ideological or prosecutorial philosophy. Or a judge may select a prosecutor apt to settle cases and enter plea bargains, so as to preserve judicial resources. *See* Wiener, Inter-Branch Appointments After the Independent Counsel: Court Appointment of United States Attorneys, 86 Minn. L. Rev. 363, 428 (2001) (concluding that court appointment of interim U.S. Attorneys is unconstitutional).

Prosecutorial authority should be exercised by the Executive Branch in a unified manner, consistent with the application of criminal enforcement policy under the Attorney General. Court-appointed U.S. Attorneys would be at least as accountable to the chief judge of the district court as to the Attorney General, which could, in some circumstances become untenable. In no context is accountability more important to our society than on the front lines of law

enforcement and the exercise of prosecutorial discretion, and the Department contends that the chief prosecutor should be accountable to the Attorney General, the President, and ultimately the people.

H.R. 580 appears to be aimed at addressing a problem that has not arisen. The Administration has repeatedly demonstrated its commitment to having a Senate-confirmed U.S. Attorney in every federal district. As noted, when a vacancy in the office of U.S. Attorney occurs, the Department typically looks first to the First Assistant or another senior manager in the office to serve as an acting or interim U.S. Attorney. Where neither the First Assistant nor another senior manager is able or willing to serve as an acting or interim U.S. Attorney, or where their service would not be appropriate under the circumstances, the Administration has looked to other Department employees to serve temporarily. No matter which way a U.S. Attorney is temporarily appointed, the Administration has consistently sought, and will continue to seek, to fill the vacancy—in consultation with home-State Senators—with a presidentially-nominated and Senate-confirmed nominee. The Department, therefore, does not believe a case has been made to repeal the current authority for appointing interim U.S. Attorneys.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify, and I look forward to answering the Committee's questions.

Silas, Adrien

From: Scott-Finan, Nancy
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2007 5:56 PM
To: Silas, Adrien
Cc: Hertling, Richard; Moschella, William; Goodling, Monica
Subject: HR 580

Attachments: DRAFT Moschella Testimony3.wpd

DRAFT Moschella Testimony3.wpd...

Please send the attached testimony to OMB.

Department of Justice

STATEMENT

OF

WILLIAM E. MOSCHELLA
PRINCIPAL ASSOCIATE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

CONCERNING

"H.R. 580, RESTORING CHECKS AND BALANCES IN THE NOMINATION PROCESS OF U.S. ATTORNEYS"

PRESENTED ON

MARCH 6, 2007

Testimony
of

William E. Moschella
Principal Associate Deputy Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice

Committee on the Judiciary
United States House of Representatives

"H.R. 580, Restoring Checks and Balances in the Nomination Process of U.S. Attorneys"

March 6, 2007

Chairman Conyers, Congressman Smith, and members of the Committee, thank you for the invitation to discuss the importance of the Justice Department's United States Attorneys.

The Department of Justice opposes H.R. 580, the "Preserving United States Attorneys Independence Act of 2007" as presently drafted for the reasons set forth herein.

As the chief federal law-enforcement officers in their districts, our 93 U.S. Attorneys represent the Attorney General and the Department of Justice throughout the United States. U.S. Attorneys are not just prosecutors; they are government officials charged with managing and implementing the policies and priorities of the President and the Attorney General. The Attorney General has set forth key priorities for the Department of Justice, and in each of their districts, U.S. Attorneys lead the Department's efforts to protect America from terrorist attacks and fight violent crime, combat illegal drug trafficking, ensure the integrity of government and

the marketplace, enforce our immigration laws, and prosecute crimes that endanger children and families—including child pornography, obscenity, and human trafficking.

United States Attorneys serve at the pleasure of the President. Like any other high-ranking officials in the Executive Branch, they may be removed for any reason or no reason. The Department of Justice—including the office of United States Attorney—was created precisely so that the government's legal business could be effectively managed and carried out through a coherent program under the supervision of the Attorney General. Unlike judges, who are supposed to act independently of those who nominate them, U.S. Attorneys are accountable to the Attorney General, and through him, to the President—the head of the Executive Branch. This accountability ensures compliance with Department policy, and is often recognized by the Members of Congress who write to the Department to encourage various U.S. Attorneys' Offices to focus on a particular area of law enforcement.

The Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General are responsible for evaluating the performance of the United States Attorneys and ensuring that they are leading their offices effectively. It should come as no surprise to anyone that, in an organization as large as the Justice Department, U.S. Attorneys are removed or asked or encouraged to resign from time to time. However, in this Administration U.S. Attorneys are never—repeat, 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. Any suggestion to the contrary is unfounded, and it irresponsibly undermines the reputation for impartiality the Department has earned over many years and on which it depends.

Turnover in the position of U.S. Attorney is not uncommon and should be expected, particularly after a U.S. Attorney's four-year term has expired. When a presidential election results in a change of administration, every U.S. Attorney leaves and the new President nominates a successor for confirmation by the Senate. Moreover, U.S. Attorneys do not necessarily stay in place even during an administration. For example, approximately half of the U.S. Attorneys appointed at the beginning of the Bush Administration had left office by the end of 2006. Of the U.S. Attorneys whose resignations have been the subject of recent discussion, each one had served longer than four years prior to being asked to resign.

Given the reality of turnover among the United States Attorneys, our system depends heavily on the dedicated service of the career investigators and prosecutors. While a new U.S. Attorney may articulate new priorities or emphasize different types of cases, the effect of a U.S. Attorney's departure on an existing investigation is, in fact, minimal, and that is as it should be. The career civil servants who prosecute federal criminal cases are dedicated professionals and an effective U.S. Attorney relies on the professional judgment of those prosecutors.

The leadership of an office is more than the direction of individual cases. It involves managing limited resources, maintaining high morale in the office, and building relationships with federal, state, and local law enforcement partners. When a U.S. Attorney submits his or her resignation, the Department must first determine who will serve temporarily as interim U.S. Attorney. The Department 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-appointed, Senate-confirmed United States Attorney. Often, the Department looks

to the First Assistant U.S. Attorney or another senior manager in the office to serve as U.S. Attorney on an interim basis. When neither the First Assistant nor another senior manager in the office is able or willing to serve as interim U.S. Attorney, or when the appointment of either would not be appropriate in the circumstances, the Department has looked to other, qualified Department employees. For example, in the District of Minnesota and the Northern District of Iowa, the First Assistant took federal retirement at or near the same time that the U.S. Attorney resigned, which required the Department to select another official to lead the office.

At no time, however, has the Administration sought to avoid the confirmation process in the Senate by appointing an interim U.S. Attorney and then refusing to move forward—in consultation with home-State Senators—on the selection, nomination, confirmation and appointment of a new U.S. Attorney. Not once. In every single case where a vacancy occurs, the Bush Administration is committed to having a United States Attorney who is confirmed by the Senate. And the Administration's actions bear this out. Every time a vacancy has arisen, the President has either made a nomination, or the Administration is working to select candidates for nomination. The appointment of U.S. Attorneys by and with the advice and consent of the Senate is unquestionably the appointment method preferred by the Senate, and it is unquestionably the appointment method preferred by the Administration.

Since January 20, 2001, 125 new U.S. Attorneys have been nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. On March 9, 2006, the Congress amended the Attorney General's authority to appoint interim U.S. Attorneys, and 16 vacancies have occurred since that date. This amendment has not changed our commitment to nominating candidates for Senate

confirmation. In fact, the Administration has nominated a total of 15 individuals for Senate consideration since the appointment authority was amended, with 12 of those nominees having been confirmed to date. Of the 16 vacancies that have occurred since the time that the law was amended, the Administration has nominated candidates to fill five of these positions, has interviewed candidates for nomination for seven more positions, and is waiting to receive names to set up interviews for the remaining positions—all in consultation with home-state Senators.

However, while that nomination process continues, the Department must have a leader in place to carry out the important work of these offices. To ensure an effective and smooth transition during U.S. Attorney vacancies, the office of the U.S. Attorney must be filled on an interim basis. To do so, the Department relies on the Vacancy Reform Act ("VRA"), 5 U.S.C. § 3345(a)(1), when the First Assistant is selected to lead the office, or the Attorney General's appointment authority in 28 U.S.C. § 546 when another Department employee is chosen. Under the VRA, the First Assistant may serve in an acting capacity for only 210 days, unless a nomination is made during that period. Under an Attorney General appointment, the interim U.S. Attorney serves until a nominee is confirmed the Senate. There is no other statutory authority for filling such a vacancy, and thus the use of the Attorney General's appointment authority, as amended last year, signals nothing other than a decision to have an interim U.S. Attorney who is not the First Assistant. It does not indicate an intention to avoid the confirmation process, as some have suggested.

H.R. 580 would supersede last year's amendment to 28 U.S.C. § 546 that authorized the Attorney General to appoint an interim U.S. Attorney to serve until a person fills the position by

being confirmed by the Senate and appointed by the President. Last year's amendment was intended to ensure continuity of operations in the event of a U.S. Attorney vacancy that lasts longer than expected. H.R. 580 would not permit the Attorney General's authority under current law to be tested in practice.

Prior to last year's amendment, the Attorney General could appoint an interim U.S. Attorney for the first 120 days after a vacancy arose; thereafter, the district court was authorized to appoint an interim U.S. Attorney. In cases in which a Senate-confirmed U.S. Attorney could not be appointed within 120 days, the limitation on the Attorney General's appointment authority resulted in recurring problems. Some district courts recognized the conflicts inherent in the appointment of an interim U.S. Attorney who would then have matters before the court—not to mention the oddity of one branch of government appointing officers of another—and simply refused to exercise the appointment authority. In those cases, the Attorney General was consequently required to make multiple successive 120-day interim appointments. Other district courts ignored the inherent conflicts and sought to appoint as interim U.S. Attorneys wholly unacceptable candidates who lacked the required clearances or appropriate qualifications.

Two examples demonstrate the shortcomings of the previous system and the system contemplated in H.R. 580. During President Reagan's Administration, the district court appointed in the Southern District of West Virginia an interim U.S. Attorney who was neither a Justice Department employee nor a cleared individual. The new U.S. Attorney sought access to law-enforcement sensitive investigative materials related to the office's most sensitive public

corruption investigation. The problem was that the interim U.S. Attorney had no clearances or had then undergone a background investigation so that the Attorney General and the Federal Bureau of Investigation could have complete confidence in the individual. The appointment forced the Department to remove the case files from the U.S. Attorney's office and bring them to Washington. In the end, the Department expedited the nomination of the permanent U.S. Attorney and appointed him to replace the court-appointed individual pending his confirmation.

In a second case, occurring in 2005, the district court appointed as interim U.S. Attorney in South Dakota an individual who similarly was not a Department of Justice or federal employee and had never undergone the appropriate background check. As a result, the interim U.S. Attorney could have no access to classified information. The U.S. Attorney could not receive information from his district's anti-terrorism coordinator, its Joint Terrorism Task Force, or its Field Intelligence Group. In a post 9/11 world, this situation was unacceptable.

Despite these two notorious instances, in most cases, the district courts have simply appointed the Attorney General's choice as interim U.S. Attorney, revealing the fact that most judges have recognized the importance of appointing an interim U.S. Attorney who enjoys the confidence of the Attorney General. In other words, the most important factor in the selection of past court-appointed interim U.S. Attorneys was the Attorney General's recommendation. By foreclosing the possibility of judicial appointment of interim U.S. Attorneys unacceptable to the Administration, last year's amendment to Section 546 appropriately eliminated a procedure that created unnecessary problems without any apparent benefit.

The Department's principal objection to H.R. 580 is that it would be 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. We are aware of no other agency where federal judges—members of a separate branch of government—appoint on an interim basis senior, policymaking staff of an agency. Such a judicial appointee would have authority for litigating the entire federal criminal and civil docket before the very district court to whom he or she was beholden for the appointment. This arrangement, at a minimum, gives rise to an appearance of potential conflict that undermines the performance or perceived performance of both the Executive and Judicial Branches. A judge may be inclined to select a U.S. Attorney who shares the judge's ideological or prosecutorial philosophy. Or a judge may select a prosecutor apt to settle cases and enter plea bargains, so as to preserve judicial resources. *See* Wiener, Inter-Branch Appointments After the Independent Counsel: Court Appointment of United States Attorneys, 86 Minn. L. Rev. 363, 428 (2001) (concluding that court appointment of interim U.S. Attorneys is unconstitutional).

Prosecutorial authority should be exercised by the Executive Branch in a unified manner, consistent with the application of criminal enforcement policy under the Attorney General. Court-appointed U.S. Attorneys would be at least as accountable to the chief judge of the district court as to the Attorney General, which could, in some circumstances become untenable. In no context is accountability more important to our society than on the front lines of law enforcement and the exercise of prosecutorial discretion, and the Department contends that the chief prosecutor should be accountable to the Attorney General, the President, and ultimately the people.

H.R. 580 appears to be aimed at addressing a problem that has not arisen. The Administration has repeatedly demonstrated its commitment to having a Senate-confirmed U.S. Attorney in every federal district. As noted, when a vacancy in the office of U.S. Attorney occurs, the Department typically looks first to the First Assistant or another senior manager in the office to serve as an acting or interim U.S. Attorney. Where neither the First Assistant nor another senior manager is able or willing to serve as an acting or interim U.S. Attorney, or where their service would not be appropriate under the circumstances, the Administration has looked to other Department employees to serve temporarily. No matter which way a U.S. Attorney is temporarily appointed, the Administration has consistently sought, and will continue to seek, to fill the vacancy—in consultation with home-State Senators—with a presidentially-nominated and Senate-confirmed nominee. The Department, therefore, does not believe a case has been made to repeal the current authority for appointing interim U.S. Attorneys.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify, and I look forward to answering the Committee's questions.

Silas, Adrien

From: Goodling, Monica
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2007 6:27 PM
To: Scott-Finan, Nancy; Silas, Adrien
Subject: RE: HR 580

Sorry for the delay -- I kept getting pulled into other things. A few errors that I see:

Since January 20, 2001, 124 new U.S. Attorneys have been nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. On March 9, 2006, the Congress amended the Attorney General's authority to appoint interim U.S. Attorneys, and 18 vacancies have occurred since that date. This amendment has not changed our commitment to nominating candidates for Senate confirmation. In fact, the Administration has nominated a total of 16 individuals for Senate consideration since the appointment authority was amended, with 12 of those nominees having been confirmed to date. Of the 18 vacancies that have occurred since the time that the law was amended, the Administration has nominated candidates to fill six of these positions, has interviewed candidates for nomination for eight more positions, and is waiting to receive names to set up interviews for the remaining positions—all in consultation with home-state Senators.

Also:

Two examples demonstrate the shortcomings of the previous system and the system contemplated in H.R. 580. During President Reagan's Administration, the district court appointed in the Southern District of West Virginia an interim U.S. Attorney who was neither a Justice Department employee nor an individual who had been subject of a FBI background review. The court-appointed U.S. Attorney, who had ties to a political party, sought access to law-enforcement sensitive investigative materials related to the office's most sensitive public corruption investigation, which was targeting a state-wide leader of the same party. The problem was that the interim U.S. Attorney had no clearances or had then undergone a background investigation so that the Attorney General and the Federal Bureau of Investigation could have complete confidence in the individual or her reasons for making inquiries into the case. The appointment forced the Department to remove the case files from the U.S. Attorney's office in order to protect the integrity of the investigation and prohibit the U.S. Attorney from making any additional inquiries into the case. In addition, the Department expedited a nomination for the permanent U.S. Attorney and with the extraordinary assistance of the Senate, he was confirmed to replace the court-appointed individual within a few weeks.

In a second case, occurring in 2005, the district court attempted to appoint an individual who similarly was not a Department of Justice or federal employee and had never undergone the appropriate background check. As a result, this individual could have no access to classified information. This individual could not receive information from his district's anti-terrorism coordinator, its Joint Terrorism Task Force, or its Field Intelligence Group. In a post 9/11 world, this situation was unacceptable.

From: Scott-Finan, Nancy
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2007 5:56 PM
To: Silas, Adrien

Cc: Hertling, Richard; Moschella, William; Goodling, Monica
Subject: HR 580

Please send the attached << File: DRAFT Moschella Testimony3.wpd >> testimony to OMB.