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We celebrate an anniversary today. On July 30, 1974 — 40 years ago to the day — President Nixon released the White House tape recordings to comply with an order of the U.S. Supreme Court. Just one day earlier, the House Judiciary Committee approved Articles of Impeachment against the President. Article 2 dealt with “abuse of power.” The first count complained that the President attempted to use the Internal Revenue Service to harass his enemies.

(1) He has, acting personally and through his subordinated and agents, endeavored to obtain from the Internal Revenue Service, in violation of the constitutional rights of citizens, confidential information contained in income tax returns for purposes not authorized by law, and to cause, in violation of the constitutional rights of citizens, income tax audits or other income tax investigation to be initiated or conducted in a discriminatory manner. [Emphasis added.]1

1 http://www.historyplace.com/unitedstates/impeachments/nixon.htm
I remember the incident quite well because I was then assistant majority counsel to the Senate Watergate Select Committee. Note that the charge was not that the President had caused the IRS to engage in discriminatory enforcement of the tax laws. No, the claim was that the President had tried, unsuccessfully, to do so.

We all will agree that any claim that a federal official has ever tried to use the IRS to attack or harass those perceived to be political opponents is very serious, because it undercuts the faith that we have in an honest IRS. Our tax system is, to a great extent, voluntary: we report our income and list our deductions. When the people lose faith in the IRS as a nonpartisan agency, we are all the worse for that. Thus, we should all be happy if the President is correct when he assured us that there is “not even a smidgen of corruption” regarding Lois G. Lerner and the IRS targeting of Tea Party groups.

The problem is that there are many suggestions of much more than a smidgen of corruption. We would like to know what was the basis for the President’s assurance that there is not a smidgen of corruption. What did the Department of Justice tell him that allowed him to represent to the American people that there is not a smidgen of corruption? We would not expect the President to plead Executive Privilege to the information he received because the point of him receiving it was to pass it on to the people, to all of us.

2 For your information, I am attaching a copy of my latest resume at the end of this testimony.


4 E.g., http://www.forbes.com/sites/robertwood/2014/06/14/dear-mr-president-is-there-a-smidgen-of-corruption-in-irs-lost-lerner-emails/; http://thehill.com/policy/finance/197224-obama-not-a-smidgen-of-corruption-behind-irs-targeting; http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2014/02/03/not-even-smidgen-corruption-obama-downplays-irs-other-scandals/. The President acknowledged that the then-IRS Commissioner Doug Shulman visited the White House more than 100 times but said he could not recall speaking to him on any of these occasions.

5 One cannot plead attorney client privilege when the client (the President) asks the lawyer (the Department of Justice) to evaluate information (the Lois Lerner controversy) so that the client can rely on that evaluation to assuage or satisfy the concerns of third parties (e.g. Congress, the American People). E.g., RONALD D. ROTUNDA & JOHN S. DZIENKOWSKI, LEGAL Footnote continued on next page.
Yet, information is not forthcoming. We know, for example, that —

- Ms. Lerner pled the Fifth Amendment and refused to testify before Congress, oddly enough just after assuring us, under oath, that she did nothing wrong and had no need to plead the Fifth Amendment.
- The Department of Justice (DOJ) interviewed her about these most serious allegations, but DOJ has, oddly enough, not disclosed the content of her interview — although doing so could support the President’s claim that there is not a “smidgen of corruption” if she really did nothing wrong.
- Since February of 2010 (about nine months before the elections of 2010), The IRS began targeting conservative nonprofit groups for enhanced scrutiny when they filed their routine application for tax-exempt status.
- The IRS focused on groups with “Tea Party” in their name, and on February 1, 2011, Lois G. Lerner wrote that the “Tea Party matter [was] very dangerous.”
- Months after the President assured us that there is not a “smidgen of corruption,” the Inspector General for Tax Administration (IG) issued an audit report that concluded that the IRS “systematically” used “Inappropriate Criteria” to “Identify Tax-Exempt Applications for Review.”

ETHICS: THE LAWYER’S DESKBOOK ON PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY §§ 2.3-1, 2.3-2, & 2.3-3 (ABA, West-Reuters 2014-2014 edition); Proposed Federal Rule of Evidence 503(b)(4); RESTATEMENT OF THE LAW GOVERNING LAWYERS, Third §§ 70, 71, & Comment d (ALI 2000). By analogy, whatever the extent of Executive Privilege, it should not apply to information that the President has publicly disclosed. See also, e.g., RONALD D. ROTUNDA & JOHN S. DZIENKOWSKI, supra, at § 1.6-2-2(a): “The client may inadvertently lose the attorney-client evidentiary privilege. For example, if the client voluntarily reveals a portion of his privileged communications, courts typically find that he may not withhold the remainder.”

I do not mean to suggest that the abuse of the IRS powers is limited to Tea Party groups. We recently learned, from an email, that Ms. Learner was also interested in using IRS powers against Senator Charles E. Grassley (Republican, Iowa). Any IRS investigation can be very onerous, although the targeted taxpayer has done nothing wrong. The IRS can demand records going back many years. The taxpayer may not respond to the IRS in the way that the IRS has responded, by announcing, belatedly, that it has “accidently” destroyed relevant documents.
• Nonetheless, on March 22, 2012, IRS Commissioner Douglas Shulman assured the House Ways and Means Committee that “I can give you assurances * * * [t]here is absolutely no targeting” of Tea Party groups applying for tax-exempt status.
• On May 15, 2013, the President called the IRS’s targeting “inexcusable,” yet on February 2, 2014, he represented that there was “‘not even a smidgen of corruption’” in connection with the IRS targeting activity, but did not explain what information caused him to change his mind.
• Many emails and other forms of electronic communication related to the Lois Lerner matter have disappeared, or perhaps not disappeared — the IRS has not been completely and promptly forthcoming on this issue. The emails that the IRS belatedly said are “lost” just happen to fall within the time frame from January 1, 2009 and April 2011, the period that is directly relevant.7
• Last month, the IRS agreed to pay $50,0008 for the illegal disclosure of tax return information — “leaking” the 2008 tax return and list of major donors of the National Organization for Marriage [NOM] to an activist who turned over that tax data to NOM’s adversary, the Human Rights Campaign. The President of that organization just happened to be the national Co-Chair of President Obama’s Reelection Campaign.9 This

7 Of course, the Special Counsel would also want to subpoena all the most recent emails in order to determine how present IRS officials responded to the disclosure of the IRS illegal targeting.


9 In testimony on June 4, 2013, John Eastman, who is Chairman of the Board, of the National Organization for Marriage and also Professor of Law at Chapman University’s Dale E. Fowler School of Law, testified:

March 30, 2012, NOM became aware that its confidential tax information—specifically, its 2008 Form 990 Schedule B—had been obtained by the Human Rights Campaign (“HRC”)—NOM’s principal opponent in the political battles over the redefinition of marriage—published on its website, and republished on numerous other websites such as the Huffington Post.

Footnote continued on next page.
relationship shows an obvious conflict of interest, when lawyers supporting the President are ultimately in charge of the investigation that involves the national Co-Chair of President Obama’s Reelection Campaign.

- When NOM deposed this activist who received the confidential IRS tax information, he (like Ms. Lerner) pled the Fifth Amendment. The DOJ indicated that it would not be filing any charges against this person. Hence, NOM asked the DOJ to give him immunity. That would force him to testify but not compromise any criminal investigation against him because the DOJ said it would not be filing charges. Inexplicably, the DOJ refused to grant him immunity.\(^\text{10}\) That decision appears to place the DOJ in a conflict between its job to find out what happened and a conflicting interest in not finding out what happened.

As we know, there is no longer a special statute that provides for a Special Prosecutor or Independent Counsel. However, the Attorney General does not need a statute in order to appoint a Special Counsel. There was a Special Counsel in the Teapot Dome scandal although there was no statutory authorization. Similarly, there was no statutory authorization for the appointment of a Special Counsel in the Watergate affair.

What we have now, as in the case of Watergate, is a regulation. We find the relevant regulations in Code of Federal Regulations, Title 28: Judicial Administration, Chapter VI. Offices of Independent Counsel, Department of Justice, Part 600, General Powers of Special Counsel. In particular, we look at 28 C.F.R. § 600.1. It provides:

The Attorney General, or in cases in which the Attorney General is recused, the Acting Attorney General, will appoint a Special Counsel when he or she determines that criminal investigation of a person or matter is warranted and--

(a) That investigation or prosecution of that person or matter by a United States Attorney's Office or litigating Division of the

Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, Hearing on Internal Revenue Service Targeting of Non-Profit Entities Because of their Political Views, June 4, 2013, testimony of Dr. John C. Eastman.

Department of Justice would present a conflict of interest for the Department or other extraordinary circumstances; and

(b) That under the circumstances, it would be in the public interest to appoint an outside Special Counsel to assume responsibility for the matter.

The Attorney General has already determined that there should be a criminal investigation. We also know that the Department of Justice is in a conflict of interest in continuing that investigation, because the President has compromised it. That occurred when the President (the chief law enforcement officer of the United States) announced last February that there has not been a “smidgen of corruption” even though neither he nor the Department of Justice could have examined all the evidence, in particular the emails and other electronic information. The Attorney General and all top officials of the Department of Justice serve at the pleasure of the President. They are in a conflict because any impartial investigation could serve to undercut the representation and solemn assurance of the President that there is not a smidgen or hint of any IRS corruption in the Lois Lerner affair. The Department of Justice is also in a conflict because an impartial investigator will have to determine if DOJ lawyers were aiding Mr. Lerner in a cover-up of the IRS targeting scandal when they interviewed her after she pled the Fifth Amendment. We cannot expect the DOJ to impartially investigate itself.

We also know that the present circumstances are extraordinary. Emails disappear. IRS backup disks are destroyed, while the IRS is involved in litigation where those backup disks are relevant. The IRS does not appear to keep the records that the law requires it to keep. The President assures the American People that there is no hint, “not a smidgen of corruption,” although the DOJ has not yet completed its purported investigation. The Attorney General and other lawyers in charge of the investigation are political supporters of the President, raising another conflict under the Washington, D.C. Rules of Professional Conduct governing lawyers.\footnote{\textsuperscript{11}}

\footnotetext{\textsuperscript{11}} Washington D.C. Rules of Professional Conduct: Rule 1.7(b)(4), explaining that there is a conflict if —

The lawyer’s professional judgment on behalf of the client will be or reasonably may be adversely affected by the lawyer’s responsibilities to or interests in a third party or the lawyer’s own financial, business, property, or personal interests. [Emphasis added]
We also know that there most certainly is the appearance of a conflict of interest\textsuperscript{12} when lawyers within the Department of Justice who are supporters of the President are ultimately in charge of the investigation that involves the national Co-Chair of President Obama’s Reelection Campaign. There is also a conflict because the President appears to have undermined any DOJ investigation by announcing the conclusion before the investigation was complete. Let me put the matter in another way: if the DOJ and the Attorney General wanted to hide the evidence that one or more Administration officials used the IRS to harass opponents, they would act exactly the way they are acting now.

The Attorney General can restore America’s faith in the nonpartisanship of the Internal Revenue Service by fulfilling his duties under §600.1. He should appoint a Special Counsel. The Counsel should probably be a prominent Republican. Recall that during the Watergate controversy, the Attorney General appointed a prominent Democrat, first Archibald Cox and then Leon Jaworski. If a Democrat had given Nixon a clean bill of health, the people would have believed it. Similarly, if now, the Attorney General appoints a Republican to investigate the misuse of the IRS, and if that Republican finds not a smidgen of corruption, the people will believe that. If, on the other hand, the Special Counsel finds corruption and a cover-up, well, let the chips fall where they may.

Granted, this Special Counsel regulation is not a statute, but it is still the law. As the Supreme Court explained in United States v. Nixon, 418 U.S. 683, 695, 94 S. Ct. 3090, 3101, 41 L. Ed. 2d 1039 (1974),\textsuperscript{13} when referring to the regulations that governed the Attorney General’s appointment of a Special Counsel: “So long as this regulation is extant it has the force of law.” The Court went on to discuss the most analogous precedent:

In United States ex rel. Accardi v. Shaughnessy, 347 U.S. 260, 74 S.Ct. 499, 98 L.Ed. 681 (1954), regulations of the Attorney General delegated certain of his discretionary powers to the Board of Immigration Appeals and required that Board to exercise its own discretion on appeals in deportation cases. The Court held that so long as the Attorney General’s regulations remained operative, he denied himself the authority to exercise the


\textsuperscript{13} See discussion in 2 RONALD D. ROTUNDA & JOHN E. NOWAK, TREATISE ON CONSTITUTIONAL LAW: SUBSTANCE AND PROCEDURE § 9.6(e) (West Thomson Reuters, 5th ed. 2012 (6-volume Treatise).
discretion delegated to the Board even though the original authority was his and he could reassert it by amending the regulations. Service v. Dulles, 354 U.S. 363, 388, 77 S.Ct. 1152, 1165, 1 L.Ed.2d 1403 (1957), and Vitarelli v. Seaton, 359 U.S. 535, 79 S.Ct. 968, 3 L.Ed.2d 1012 (1959), reaffirmed the basic holding of Accardi.


Government officials require us to turn square corners with dealing with them. They should turn square corners when they deal with us. The Attorney General should follow his own regulations, because by those regulations he denied himself the authority to exercise discretion to refuse to appoint a Special Counsel.
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