

BRENNAN

CENTER

FOR JUSTICE

TWENTY
YEARS

TRUMP-RUSSIA
INVESTIGATIONS:
A GUIDE

Faiza Patel, Rachel Levinson-Waldman, Douglas Keith, and Harsha Panduranga

ABOUT THE BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE

The Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law is a nonpartisan law and policy institute that seeks to improve our systems of democracy and justice. We work to hold our political institutions and laws accountable to the twin American ideals of democracy and equal justice for all. The Center's work ranges from voting rights to campaign finance reform, from ending mass incarceration to preserving Constitutional protection in the fight against terrorism. Part think tank, part advocacy group, part cutting-edge communications hub, we start with rigorous research. We craft innovative policies. And we fight for them — in Congress and the states, the courts, and in the court of public opinion.

ABOUT THE BRENNAN CENTER'S LIBERTY AND NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAM

The Brennan Center's Liberty and National Security Program works to advance effective national security policies that respect constitutional values and the rule of law, using innovative policy recommendations, litigation, and public advocacy. The program focuses on reining in excessive government secrecy; ensuring that counterterrorism authorities are narrowly targeted to the terrorist threat; and securing adequate oversight and accountability mechanisms.

ABOUT THE BRENNAN CENTER'S PUBLICATIONS

Red cover | Research reports offer in-depth empirical findings.

Blue cover | Policy proposals offer innovative, concrete reform solutions.

White cover | White papers offer a compelling analysis of a pressing legal or policy issue.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Faiza Patel serves as co-director of the Brennan Center's Liberty and National Security Program, which seeks to ensure that our counterterrorism laws and policies respect constitutional values and promotes transparency and accountability in national security matters. She has testified before Congress opposing the dragnet surveillance of Muslims, developed legislation creating an independent Inspector General for the NYPD, and organized advocacy efforts against anti-Muslim laws and policies. She is the author of seven reports: *The Islamophobic Administration* (2017); *Countering Violent Extremism* (2017), *Overseas Surveillance in an Interconnected World* (2016), *What Went Wrong with the FISA Court* (2015), *Foreign Law Bans* (2013), *A Proposal for an NYPD Inspector General* (2012), and *Rethinking Radicalization* (2011). Ms. Patel's writing has been featured in major newspapers including *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*, and she is a frequent commentator on national security and counterterrorism issues for print, televisions, and radio outlets. She is a member of the Board of Editors of the prominent legal blog *Just Security*. Born and raised in Pakistan, Ms. Patel is a graduate of Harvard College and the NYU School of Law.

Rachel Levinson-Waldman serves as Senior Counsel to the Brennan Center's Liberty and National Security Program. Ms. Levinson-Waldman is active on issues related to policing and technology, including providing commentary on law enforcement access to social media, predictive policing, body cameras, license plate readers, and other types of surveillance technologies deployed in public. Ms. Levinson-Waldman recently published an article in the *Emory Law Review* on the intersection of the Fourth Amendment and a range of surveillance technologies titled *Hiding in Plain Sight: A Fourth Amendment Framework for Analyzing Government Surveillance in Public* (2017). Ms. Levinson-Waldman also co-authored *The Islamophobic Administration* (2017) and authored *What the Government Does with Americans' Data* (2013). Ms. Levinson-Waldman regularly comments for television, radio, and print on issues relating to national security, privacy, and surveillance. Her writing has been featured in publications including *Bloomberg View*, *The New Republic*, *Wired*, *The Atlantic*, *The Daily Beast*, *U.S. News & World Report*, and *Salon.com*, and she has been interviewed for *Al Jazeera*, *Nerding Out*, and *Let Your Voice Be Heard*, among others. Ms. Levinson-Waldman is a graduate of Williams College and the University of Chicago Law School, and clerked for the Honorable M. Margaret McKeown of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Douglas Keith is the Katz Fellow in the Brennan Center's Democracy Program. He co-authored the Brennan Center's reports *Noncitizen Voting: The Missing Millions* (2017), *Secret Spending in the States* (2016), and *Five to Four* (2016). Prior to joining the Brennan Center, he worked on voting rights litigation as a Ford Foundation Public Interest Law Fellow at Advancement Project, trained poll workers for the New York City Board of Elections, and organized New York election reform advocates. He has also observed and analyzed democratic systems abroad for International IDEA and the National Democratic Institute. He received his J.D. from New York University School of Law.

Harsha Panduranga is a fellow in the Brennan Center's Liberty and National Security program, funded by Simpson Thacher & Bartlett, where he was a litigation associate. Harsha received a B.A., Phi Beta Kappa, and a J.D., cum laude, from the University of Michigan.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to express their deep gratitude to the Brennan Center's President, Michael Waldman, for his invaluable assistance in conceptualizing this report. They would also like to thank Nicole Austin-Hillery, Mike German, Liza Goitein, Jim Lyons, Fritz Schwarz and Vivien Watts for their input. The report could not have been completed without the assistance of the program's research and program associates, Andrew Lindsay and Erica Posey, and interns, Margot Adams, Lamyra Agarwala, Naomi Dwork, Emily Hockett, and Ramiro Lorca. Finally, thanks are due to our communications colleagues, Beatriz Aldereguia, Alejandra Collado, and Blaire Perel for their support. The Brennan Center gratefully acknowledges The Bauman Foundation, CS Fund, Democracy Alliance Partners, Ford Foundation, and Security & Rights Collaborative, a Proteus Fund initiative, for their generous support to the Liberty and National Security Program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
I. STANDING CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES	3
II. SELECT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE	9
III. SPECIAL COUNSEL	12
IV. INDEPENDENT COUNSEL	15
V. INDEPENDENT COMMISSION	17
VI. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE INSPECTOR GENERAL	19
Conclusion	21
Endotes	22

INTRODUCTION

Americans of all political stripes are concerned about the fact that Russia attempted to interfere in the 2016 election – and the possibility that President Donald Trump’s close associates were involved and that the White House may be covering up these events, including by abruptly dismissing the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigations, James Comey, who was investigating these connections.¹ These events compel a thorough investigation, and various inquiries are already underway. In a rapidly unfolding, complex situation of this sort, what is the most effective way to conduct an investigation? Such a probe, after all, is inevitably politically charged, may not elicit cooperation from many important witnesses, and will reach into the highest levels of our government.

This is not the first time that a matter of national urgency has required a thorough investigation. In fact, history is replete with important investigations that exposed wrongdoing, explained the stakes, and educated the public. Done right, these reflect American governance at its best. This white paper explains the different investigative mechanisms available to the legislative and executive branches, drawing on past experiences to highlight their strengths and weaknesses and identifying potential pitfalls that must be managed. It comes to the following conclusions:

- The appointment of former-FBI Director Robert Mueller as special counsel should not serve as a barrier to, or a substitute for, congressional action. The Special Counsel’s criminal investigation is far narrower in scope than a proper legislative investigation. A robust congressional effort is critical to furthering transparency and rebuilding trust in our democratic institutions. Some fear conflicts between congressional inquiries and criminal investigations. The impact of congressional grants of immunity on potential criminal prosecution, which will likely be necessary to incentivize witnesses to testify, raises nettlesome questions. In fact, such potential complications have little to do with the appointment of a special counsel – the FBI investigation that Comey was managing would have posed the same challenges. They can be managed through coordination between the various stakeholders, and the risk to a potential prosecution does not negate the public’s urgent need to know the facts about an assault on American democratic institutions.
- Given the stakes, Congress should take steps to minimize partisanship. The Church Committee, which investigated CIA and FBI abuses of authority in the 1970s, stands out as a good model. As its former Chief Counsel Frederick A. O. Schwarz (who currently serves as the Brennan Center’s chief counsel), has pointed out, a key to the committee’s success was its “unusual bipartisan structure.”² Measures such as giving the majority party only a one-vote advantage over the minority, and involving the minority leadership significantly in the operation of the committee and the investigation, would go a long way towards moderating any partisan bias. The Senate Intelligence Committee recently took a good step in that direction, unanimously granting subpoena authority to the Republican chair and Democratic vice-chair.³
- It is critical that congressional investigations have sufficient resources. This is presently not the case. Current congressional investigations are being carried out by a handful of regular

committee staff. The Benghazi investigation, by contrast, worked with a staff of 57, while the 9/11 Commission had 80 staff members at its disposal. Congressional leadership should make available funds that allow the investigations to quickly ramp up their staffing.

- The intelligence committees should clarify that their mandate is broad enough to encompass not just collusion with the Russian government around the 2016 election, but other ties with Russian individuals or interests as well, where those ties could pose conflicts of interest or risks to national security. The committees should also be more transparent about how they intend to proceed with their investigations, giving the public a sense of how long they intend to take and confirming that they intend to issue a public report.

I. STANDING CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

What They Are

These are, of course, the familiar committees that continue from one congressional session to the next and are made up of members of Congress. The Senate and House Intelligence Committees, Judiciary Committees, and Oversight Committees are the best known relevant examples. Individual committees generally conduct their own investigations, though they sometimes act jointly, as in the wake of the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks.⁴

Current Status

The House and Senate Intelligence Committees and the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism have already launched investigations.⁵ While there have been hints that some in Congress view the appointment of Special Counsel Robert Mueller as a reason to slow down legislative inquiries, these investigations are thus far continuing apace. The House Intelligence Committee recently issued four subpoenas in its Russia investigation: one to Trump's former National Security Advisor General Michael Flynn, one to Trump's personal attorney, Michael Cohen, and two to the two men's businesses.⁶ While it has not announced a formal investigation, the House Oversight Committee has issued formal requests for documents related to both Comey and Flynn.⁷

Chairman Devin Nunes (R-Calif.), who had previously recused himself from the Russia investigation, also issued three subpoenas to the National Security Agency (NSA), FBI, and CIA, seeking information about the "unmasking" of the identities of Trump's associates in classified reports distributed to Obama administration officials during the transition.⁸

The Senate Intelligence Committee has also issued subpoenas, including for Flynn's records (both personal and – when that was rebuffed – to his businesses),⁹ and to Paul Manafort and Roger Stone, associates of the president. In late May, the committee voted unanimously to give its Chairman Richard Burr (R-N.C.) and Vice-Chair Mark Warner (D-Va.) "blanket authority to issue subpoenas as they deem necessary."¹⁰ In addition, the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism has called former Acting Attorney General Sally Yates and former Director of National Intelligence James Clapper to testify before it and issued subpoenas as part of its investigation.¹¹

What They Are Investigating

The committees are investigating similar but distinct aspects of the Russia story. The focus of the Senate Intelligence Committee's investigation is on the intelligence community's assessment of Russian interference and "links between Russia and individuals associated with political campaigns," as well as Russian cyber activity directed against the U.S. more broadly.¹² The House counterpart has a similar scope, and also includes investigation of what the federal government should do to protect itself in the future and prevent leaks of classified information.¹³

The Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism is examining the intelligence community's determination that Russia took an active interest and played a role in the 2016 election, and seeking to understand the methods Russia has used to target elections in other democratic countries.¹⁴ The subcommittee also declared that it intended to "assure that Congress provides the FBI the tools it needs to keep its investigative work protected from political influence." This statement was made before President Trump's surprise firing of Comey on May 9, 2017, which may have further increased the subcommittee's interest in the matter.¹⁵

What They Can Do

Committees may, of course, hold hearings at which they receive testimony or evidence.¹⁶ They can also subpoena witnesses for testimony or evidence. If an individual refuses to comply, the full House or Senate may hold them in contempt.¹⁷ Since 1975, Congress has held about a dozen high-ranking executive branch officials in criminal contempt for failure to comply with a congressional subpoena, although it is rare for someone to actually suffer a penalty.¹⁸

Committees may grant immunity to witnesses, which can induce them to testify but may also complicate subsequent prosecutions.¹⁹ Congressional investigations typically conclude with a report on the committee's findings and do not directly result in criminal charges, although several prominent investigations – such as the Watergate and Iran-Contra investigations – have been accompanied by parallel criminal inquiries and charges.²⁰

Who Picks The Committees

Because these are permanent committees, their membership is already set. Republicans control both houses of Congress and have a majority of seats on all permanent committees: a one-vote majority on the Senate Intelligence Committee and the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism, and a supermajority on the House Intelligence Committee and Oversight Committee.²¹

Strengths

Congressional investigations can uncover information that may be outside the purview of criminal investigations. The focus of the investigation Special Counsel Mueller is undertaking, for example, is on whether any criminal laws were broken by the president's associates, either in the course of the campaign or in subsequent attempts to cover up their activities. Congressional committee proceedings, by contrast, cover misconduct that might not rise to the level of criminal activity, but could nonetheless have important implications for national security and the proper administration of government.

As former Democratic Sen. Carl Levin, who oversaw several major bipartisan congressional investigations that were concurrent to criminal probes, recently observed, Congress has a broader obligation than the Department of Justice or a special counsel:

[Congress] has a duty to inform the public of the facts underlying matters of importance — to tell the public what happened, not with respect to whether a criminal law has been violated, but whether a law is needed to deter or punish misconduct in the future or to address important public policy matters. These obligations are particularly important in matters of national security and the sanctity of our electoral system.²²

One recent example is the Senate Intelligence Committee’s investigation of the CIA’s detention and interrogation program — particularly, the agency’s use of various forms of torture.²³ The committee approved its final report in 2012 by a vote of 9-6, with seven Democrats, one Independent, and one Republican voting in favor, and six Republicans voting against.²⁴ The investigation, which took five years to complete, resulted in the 2014 release of a 525-page executive summary and report of findings. While the full report has been consigned to secrecy, the summary alone demonstrated that the torture program was both more extensive and brutal than had previously been known and that, contrary to the CIA’s reports to Congress, torture did not result in actionable intelligence or cooperation from detainees.²⁵ The committee’s report was particularly important because other efforts to hold CIA officials accountable for torturing detainees had by and large been unsuccessful.²⁶ It also led to a 2015 law that limits measures used on detainees to those set out in the Army Field Manual.²⁷

Inquiries by the House Energy and Commerce Committee and its subcommittee, chaired by the now retired Rep. John Dingell (D-Mich.) and Rep. Henry Waxman (D-Calif.), respectively, led to the resignation of EPA Administrator, Anne Gorsuch Burford.²⁸ During the 1989 savings and loan collapse, which cost taxpayers hundreds of billions of dollars, the House Banking Committee held memorable sessions that exposed malfeasance and corruption in the financial industry. The Senate Ethics Committee probe of the “Keating Five” — a fistful of U.S. senators who intervened with regulators on behalf of corrupt savings and loan executive Charles Keating — publicized and explained the banking scandal that cost taxpayers billions.²⁹ The Senate Banking Committee conducted investigations of the Whitewater scandal, involving a real estate investment by then-Governor Bill Clinton. The Senate Judiciary Committee explored the firings of nine United States attorneys under the George W. Bush administration, some of whom were ousted because they refused to bring unverified charges of voter fraud. In one painful session, Attorney General Alberto Gonzales answered “I don’t recall” 64 times. Shortly after, he resigned.³⁰

Standing committees provide some logistical advantages as well: Investigations have already begun, which means that the staff has likely developed some familiarity with the issues, and unlike with a new select committee or independent commission there is no additional delay to start up. Congressional committees — particularly the standing committees — also have various points of leverage that may enhance their power *vis-à-vis* the executive branch, including “the power of the purse, the power to impeach, ... GAO investigations, and the blockage of nominations.”³¹

Indeed, the committees have already elicited on the record testimony from high-ranking officials close to the investigation, which has kept public attention focused on the issues:

- Jan. 10: The Senate Intelligence Committee heard from Comey, as well as NSA Director Michael Rogers, former Director of National Intelligence James Clapper, and former CIA Director John Brennan, on their joint report detailing Russia's involvement in the 2016 election.³²
- March 20: Comey confirmed to the House Intelligence Committee that the FBI was investigating links between Trump, his associates, and Russian involvement in the election.³³
- May 8: Former Acting Attorney General Sally Yates testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism that she had warned the White House on two occasions of Flynn's susceptibility to blackmail by Russian officials.³⁴
- June 8: Comey is scheduled to testify before the Senate Intelligence Committee about his interactions with President Trump relating to the FBI's investigation of Russian interference in the 2016 election.³⁵ This will be Comey's first public statement since his dismissal on May.

Meanwhile, the House Oversight Committee uncovered documents related to undisclosed payments Flynn received from Russian entities.³⁶

Weaknesses

Given the highly political nature of the Trump-Russia investigation, an overriding concern is whether the standing committees will act in an independent and impartial manner. As the majority party in both houses, Republicans have not only a majority of votes but also control over the committees' agendas and pace of work. At the White House's request, both Sen. Richard Burr (R-N.C.), chair of the Senate Intelligence Committee, and Rep. Nunes, chair of the House Intelligence Committee, have spoken with news reporters to refute stories reporting contact between Trump campaign staff and Russian officials.³⁷ Indeed, Nunes was forced to recuse himself from the investigation for speaking publicly about classified surveillance reports that Trump claimed vindicated his allegation that the Obama administration spied on his campaign.³⁸

Investigations can also be slowed or shut down by starving them of resources. The standing committees have very limited staff, some of who will inevitably be used to cover their regular work (for instance, the Senate Judiciary Committee recently received 10 new judicial nominations from the White House to review)³⁹ They will almost certainly be insufficient to conduct a comprehensive investigation within a reasonable timeframe.

By way of example, as of late April, the Senate Intelligence Committee had just nine staffers conducting the investigation, compared to the approximately 57 staff who supported the work of the House Select Committee on Benghazi.⁴⁰ The chart on the next page summarizes the resources utilized by comparably complex investigations.

RESOURCES SPENT ON SELECTED INVESTIGATIONS

INVESTIGATIVE BODY	DURATION	STAFFING (APPROX)	DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	WITNESSES/ INTERVIEWS	COST (APPROX)
House Benghazi Committee <i>Select Committee</i>	May 8, 2014 - June 28, 2016 & Dec. 7, 2016 (approx. 2.5 years)	49 staff members	Close to 150,000 pages (estimated from committee materials)	107 witnesses	\$7 million
Senate Committee on CIA Detention and Interrogation Program <i>Standing Committee</i>	Mar. 2009 - Dec. 13, 2012 (3.5 years)	20 staff members	6.3 million pages of CIA records	None (due to simultaneous DOJ investigation)	\$40 million
9/11 Commission <i>Independent Commission</i>	Nov. 27, 2002 - July 22, 2004 (20 months)	80 staff members, contractors, and detailees	More than 2.5 million pages of documents	160 witnesses	\$15 million
Joint Congressional Committee on 9/11 <i>Standing Committees</i>	Feb. 14, 2002 - Dec. 20, 2002 (10 months)	26 staff members	500,000+ pages of documents from Intelligence Community agencies/other sources	55 witnesses (approx)	Not available
Senate and House Iran-Contra Committees <i>Select Committees</i>	Jan. 6, 1987 - Nov. 18, 1987 (11 months)	181 staff members, including volunteers	300,000 documents	More than 500 witnesses; over 40 days of joint public hearings	\$4 Million
Senate Church Committee <i>Select Committee</i>	Jan. 27, 1975 - Apr. 29, 1976 (15 months)	100 staff members	110,000+ documents	800 witnesses in public and closed sessions	\$750,000
Watergate Select Committee <i>Select Committee</i>	Feb. 7, 1973 - June 27, 1974 (17 months)	90 staff members	Not available	37 witnesses testified, over 3,000 pages of testimony transcribed	\$500,000

Another concern is that investigations by the permanent committees may focus too narrowly on the issues that are squarely within their standard expertise.⁴¹ It is not clear that any committee intends to cover the full range of relationships – both financial and personal – among the president, his associates, and Russian government-related entities as well as private individuals. The official mandates for the investigations both the House and Senate Intelligence Committees are undertaking refer to “links between Russia” and the campaign, which could easily be read to cover individuals outside the Russian government. Since it is well known that the Russian government often operates through ostensibly private entities, these connections would be relevant to understanding indirect forms of influence and control, and could have significant implications for U.S. national security beyond explicit collusion in the 2016 election.⁴² It also appears that the intelligence committees’ understand their jurisdiction to cover Comey’s termination since he will be testifying before them.

Also, unlike a select committee or independent commission, which usually has a mandate to issue a

report and can have a set timeframe for doing so, it is not clear when and how the ongoing standing committee investigations will end. A particular concern is that any committee report would be classified. For instance, while the executive summary was critical to public debate, the full report of the Senate Intelligence Committee's investigation of the CIA's detention and interrogation program has never been released to the public. Even the summary was released two full years after the report's completion, and only because the then-chair of the committee insisted on doing so. Burr, the current chair of the Senate Intelligence Committee, has stated that the committee "will be conducting the bulk of [its] business behind closed doors," suggesting less of an inclination to push for public release of information.⁴³ This would be an unfortunate outcome. If the committee's findings are kept classified, the American people will never learn what actually happened in the 2016 election, and questions about Trump's connections to Russia will remain unanswered, continuing to cast a shadow over his presidency.

Last but not least is the issue of potential conflicts between congressional investigations and the probe being conducted by the FBI, which have been invoked to suggest that the legislative inquiries should take a back seat. These concerns are overstated, however, as such conflicts can be managed. The tension primarily arises when Congress grants immunity to witnesses in order to obtain their testimony after they invoke their Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination – as Flynn recently did in refusing to comply with a Senate Intelligence Committee subpoena requesting personal records related to his contact with Russian officials.⁴⁴ While the ongoing congressional investigations have yet to grant immunity in exchange for testimony, the issue is just over the horizon.⁴⁵

To be sure, since immunity deals may impede related criminal investigations they must be made with caution. The most prominent example of such a conflict was Iran-Contra special investigative committee's decision to grant immunity to Oliver North and John Poindexter, both of whom ultimately had their convictions reversed as a result.⁴⁶

However, grants of immunity are an important means by which Congress can obtain information necessary for the conduct of investigations, and the utility of criminal prosecutions as a means of punishing wrongdoers in politically charged investigations is perhaps more limited than is commonly acknowledged. In many instances, convictions obtained in parallel prosecutions have been overturned or individuals pardoned by presidents and administrations have been able to manage the political fallout.⁴⁷ At the same time, there are certainly ways to manage potential conflicts through up-front arrangements between the prosecuting authorities and investigating committees that minimize these conflicts. For instance, Comey's upcoming testimony before the Senate Intelligence Committee was cleared by Special Counsel Mueller.⁴⁸ On the flip side, when the Senate committee investigating the Enron accounting scandal learned from the Justice Department that granting the company's treasurer immunity to testify could have scuttled some of the criminal prosecutions, it declined his request and obtained the information it needed in other ways.⁴⁹

II. SELECT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE

What It Is

A new committee, made up of selected members of Congress, formed for the specific purpose of conducting a particular investigation.⁵⁰ The party affiliations and expertise of those who serve on the committee, as well as its mandate and powers, are normally set by the resolution that establishes it.⁵¹

Current Status

Congress has not yet established a select committee, though in December, Sens. Chuck Schumer (D-N.Y.), John McCain (R-Ariz.), Jack Reed (D-R.I.), and Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) wrote a joint letter to Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell calling for one to investigate Russian interference in the 2016 election.⁵² McCain renewed his demand following Comey's firing.⁵³

What It Would Investigate

The resolution establishing the committee would set the bounds of the investigation. Because the committee would not be limited by the mandate and focus of a particular standing body, it could conduct a cross-cutting investigation that examines the range of issues at stake.

What It Can Do

Congress would likely task the committee with submitting a report within a given timeframe and possibly making recommendations for avoiding similar scenarios in the future.⁵⁴ While a resolution would set its powers and duties, typically a select committee is able to subpoena witnesses and evidence; it could also be given powers not ordinarily afforded to standing committees, including the ability to depose witnesses, seek international assistance in its investigation, and collect tax information.⁵⁵ The Iran-Contra committees, for example, were empowered to take depositions in other countries, request the assistance of foreign courts in compelling testimony from witnesses, and request other forms of international assistance.⁵⁶ The committees' final report credited the Israeli government in particular with providing unprecedented support to the investigation.⁵⁷

Who Picks The Committee

The authors of the resolution establishing the commission would dictate who may serve on the committee, or delegate the process to selected individuals. A resolution establishing a select committee would require only a majority vote to pass.⁵⁸ Unlike regular legislation, the resolution would not require the President's signature. Often, as with the Senate Watergate Committee, the majority and minority leaders of the relevant chamber have discretion to select members to serve on the committee, with the minority seating at least one less member than the majority.⁵⁹ But a resolution could put much greater constraints on membership: The resolution creating the House Select Committee on Benghazi,

for instance, specifically appointed the chair and ranking members of the House Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Homeland Security, Intelligence, Judiciary, and Oversight Committees to serve on the investigative committee.⁶⁰

Strengths

If the Republican majority in Congress desires, a select committee can be set up in ways that maximize its chances of operating in a bipartisan and effective manner. The Church Committee, established in 1975 to investigate intelligence abuses, provides a template of a successful select committee. It operated in a mostly bipartisan manner, investigated sensitive issues, and developed concrete recommendations for reform, many of which were subsequently enacted.⁶¹ Initially established by the Senate in response to news reports about the CIA spying on Americans,⁶² the committee's official mandate was much broader: The resolution establishing the committee empowered it to investigate "governmental operations with respect to intelligence activities," including whether "illegal, improper, or unethical activities were engaged in by *any* agency of the Federal Government or by *any* persons ... with respect to *any* intelligence activity."⁶³ Over the course of 16 months, the committee investigated abuses by the CIA, NSA, FBI, and other elements of the intelligence community that spanned six administrations, both Republican and Democratic.⁶⁴

The committee's structure and mandate, set partly by the resolution establishing it and partly by the rules of procedure the committee itself adopted, contributed to its effectiveness. Democrats, who held a wide majority in the Senate at the time, had only a simple majority on the committee.⁶⁵ (In contrast, the Republicans granted themselves a supermajority on the highly partisan House Select Committee on Benghazi; as House Majority Leader Kevin McCarthy acknowledged, the committee had the express goal of undermining Hillary Clinton's candidacy for president.⁶⁶) Sen. Frank Church, chair of the Church Committee, also made other efforts to boost bipartisanship. He ensured that the ranking Republican on the committee, Sen. John Tower, played a prominent role in the committee's work, naming him as vice chair and empowering him to conduct a number of public hearings.⁶⁷ Church sought consensus for committee actions, and he and Tower worked side-by-side to negotiate with the White House in pursuit of information the executive branch was reluctant to provide.⁶⁸ Finally, the committee's broad mandate, and the defined yet reasonably substantial time it had to conduct its investigation – one year, later extended to 16 months – empowered the committee to select which lines of inquiry to pursue.⁶⁹ A limited time period also helps to ensure that the American public gets information and a resolution sooner than later – a critical goal when the matter under investigation poses ongoing risks to national security.

The experience of the Church Committee shows that a select committee could be designed to fit the needs of a particular situation. Thus, it could be given a mandate broader than the current congressional investigations, so that all of the national security implications of relationships between Trump's associates and various Russian entities are brought to light. Its chair and membership could be chosen both with an eye to subject matter expertise and the goal of enhancing the committee's independence and impartiality – real and perceived. By allocating sufficient resources, Congress could make clear that

it takes seriously the information that has emerged about undue Russian influence on the election and more broadly, the U.S. government. The table on page 5 above shows the level of resources expended on previous investigations of comparable complexity.

Finally, as with standing congressional committees, the work of a select committee would serve as an important counterpart to the criminal investigation. The famed Senate Watergate Committee illustrates that the work of different investigatory bodies can turn out to be complementary, even in an intensely partisan atmosphere. The existence of critical recordings of then-President Richard Nixon's conversations was first revealed to the committee at a public hearing,⁷⁰ but the path to their release was complicated. The ranking Republican member Sen. Howard Baker was secretly colluding with the Nixon White House at the beginning of the investigation,⁷¹ and both he and the chair initially agreed to a deal to release only summaries of the tapes. The Watergate Committee's reputation was severely damaged by these events, but the committee eventually voted unanimously to subpoena the recorded conversations.⁷² While courts declined to enforce the committee's subpoena,⁷³ they upheld the validity of parallel subpoenas issued by the special prosecutor.⁷⁴ Within three weeks, Republicans on the House Judiciary Committee announced that they would support Nixon's impeachment, leading to his resignation.⁷⁵

Weaknesses

It seems unlikely that a Republican Congress will set up a select committee to investigate a president from its own party when there are already ongoing investigations by standing committees and a special counsel has been appointed. A new committee may duplicate the work of other congressional investigations already underway, and require time to become operational. Its added value is, to a great extent, dependent on its membership, rules, resources, and mandate. A Benghazi-style committee – that is, one that is obviously partisan and was created with a predetermined political outcome in mind – would detract from the goal of reaching an independent and unbiased accounting. And as with standing committees, a select committee would have to coordinate with Special Counsel Mueller in making decisions to grant immunity to witnesses.

III. SPECIAL COUNSEL

What It Is

A special counsel is a federal prosecutor appointed by the attorney general, or deputy attorney general if the former is recused, to run an investigation that would present a conflict of interest for Justice Department officials to supervise through the ordinary chains of command. While special counsels are afforded considerable independence in the course of pursuing an investigation, they ultimately report to the attorney general. The attorney general also sets the budget (with input from the special counsel), though the Department of Justice is required by regulation to provide the position with “all appropriate resources.”⁷⁶

Current Status

On May 17, 2017, former FBI Director Robert Mueller was appointed as special counsel to investigate links between the Russian government and Trump campaign. Mueller’s appointment was pursuant to a set of regulations promulgated by then Attorney General Janet Reno in 1999 – which allow for the appointment of a special counsel when an investigation or prosecution by the U.S. attorney’s office or Justice Department’s litigating division would bring about a conflict of interest “or other extraordinary circumstances,” and appointing a special counsel would be in the public interest.⁷⁷ In this case, the appointment was grounded in concerns about preserving the FBI’s independence in conducting the investigation following the President’s dismissal of Comey. The special counsel must be a lawyer from outside of government with a “reputation for integrity and impartial decision making” and sufficient experience to conduct the investigation.⁷⁸

Justice Department employees, including FBI agents, will carry out the investigation.⁷⁹ But they will not be “subject to the day-to-day supervision of any official of the [Justice] Department,”⁸⁰ reporting instead to Mueller. However, as discussed below, the attorney general and the president retain considerable authority over the investigation in other ways.

What It Is Investigating

The special counsel’s jurisdiction is defined by the Justice Department. Between his official mandate and the applicable regulations, Mueller has been tasked with investigating “any links and/or coordination between the Russian government and individuals associated with the campaign of President Donald Trump,” as well as any other matters that arise directly from that investigation, including obstruction of justice and perjury.⁸¹ The Department of Justice, in this case acting through Rosenstein, can broaden the special counsel’s jurisdiction if necessary.⁸²

What It Can Do

Special counsels have the full power of a U.S. attorney to investigate and prosecute crimes.⁸³ These

powers include the ability to compel document production or witness testimony, file criminal charges or civil complaints, arrest defendants, as well as negotiate plea bargains and try cases. The special counsel may not be able to charge the president himself with a crime,⁸⁴ and his powers are cabined in several other ways, described below.

Who Picks The Investigator

Generally, the attorney general determines whether to appoint a special counsel. However, since Attorney General Jeff Sessions recused himself from the Russia investigation due to his involvement in the Trump campaign and communications with Russian officials,⁸⁵ Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein appointed Mueller.

Strengths

A special counsel has significant independence from the attorney general, and Mueller in particular appears to have bipartisan respect as someone who will conduct a thorough and independent investigation. As a prosecutor, he will of course have the power to subpoena documents and witnesses, and his probe will benefit from the substantial professional expertise of the lawyers who will be helping manage it and the FBI agents who will be conducting the underlying investigatory work.⁸⁶ In addition, the special counsel will be able to follow the evidence where it leads, without the need to balance competing demands from colleagues or seek unanimity – a challenge that congressional committee structures face.

Weaknesses

While the appointment of Special Counsel Mueller is a critical step in investigating the charges surrounding the Trump campaign, it is no substitute or a broader congressional inquiry. Moreover, there are several mechanisms by which the Justice Department or the President Trump could impede the investigation.

First, while Mueller is authorized to “exercise all investigative and prosecutorial functions of any United States Attorney,”⁸⁷ these come with the limitations under which all U.S. attorneys operate. Mueller must get the DOJ’s approval for certain actions that he may undertake in the course of the investigation, such as issuing subpoenas to the media or lawyers, or granting immunity to witnesses.⁸⁸ He must also follow the department’s “urgent report” procedures, which require him to report to the Deputy attorney general at least three days in advance of any “major developments in significant investigations and litigation,” as well as “events affecting the Department that are likely to generate national media or congressional attention.”⁸⁹ This would include not only arrests and criminal charges, but also the execution of search warrants or interviews with a significant witness that might trigger media coverage. Rosenstein can block these if he finds “that a proposed action by a Special Counsel was so inappropriate or unwarranted under established Departmental practices that it should not be pursued.”⁹⁰ In effect, the Justice Department has the opportunity to countermand Mueller’s investigative and prosecutorial

decisions.⁹¹ Congress will only be notified of decisions to overrule Mueller once the investigation concludes, and public disclosure of these decisions is at Rosenstein's discretion.

Second, because there might be suspect connections between members of the Trump campaign and Russia that do not directly involve the Russian government itself, Mueller's mandate – which encompasses the Trump campaign and the “Russian government” – could be interpreted as too narrow. Thus far, however, Mueller seems to be taking a broad view of his mandate, having recently taken over a pre-existing Virginia-based grand jury scrutinizing Flynn's paid lobbying for a Turkish businessman with ties to Turkish President Erdogan.⁹²

In addition, the central role of the deputy attorney general in overseeing Mueller's investigation raises conflict of interest concerns. Rosenstein drafted the memo proffered as justification for Comey's termination,⁹³ which both Rosenstein and Trump have acknowledged was a pretext. This suggests that Rosenstein may be susceptible to pressure from the White House in the course of the investigation as well.⁹⁴ Moreover, because all federal prosecutors ultimately answer to the president, Mueller is vulnerable to dismissal by one of the possible targets of his investigation. Even though the applicable DOJ regulations formally limit the causes for removal to “misconduct, dereliction of duty, incapacity, conflict of interest, or for other good cause,” commentators – including those involved in drafting the regulations – have sketched out several ways Trump could relieve Mueller of his duties, including by asking Rosenstein to fire Mueller for a nebulously-defined “good cause”; using his authority as president to repeal the Reno regulations and dismiss Mueller; or asserting that the investigation undermines his Article II removal and foreign affairs powers, declaring the regulations invalid on that basis, and dismissing Mueller.⁹⁵

Indeed, previous special counsel arrangements have explicitly rejected the Reno regulations and conferred greater prosecutorial and investigatory independence. For example, in 2003 James Comey – then serving as acting attorney general – used statutory authority to appoint a special counsel to investigate the alleged unauthorized disclosure of CIA agent Valerie Plame's identity by White House officials.⁹⁶ Comey deliberately gave special counsel Patrick Fitzgerald “plenary” authority to investigate the Plame affair, meaning that he had discretion to decide what fell within the scope of the investigation.⁹⁷ Fitzgerald also enjoyed substantially more independence than Mueller because, in his role as special counsel, he was not subject to the rules governing U.S. attorneys, such as the urgent report procedures that could be used to thwart Mueller's investigation.⁹⁸

Of course, along with greater prosecutorial independence comes a greater chance of imprudent decisions regarding the scope and methods of an investigation. But both types of special counsel appointments are functionally at will – Mueller may be, and Fitzgerald could have been, terminated by the person who appointed them.⁹⁹

IV. INDEPENDENT COUNSEL

What It Is

Though the position no longer exists, the independent counsel was a prosecutor from outside the Justice Department recommended by the attorney general and appointed by a three-judge panel from the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

Current Status

While the terms “independent counsel” and “special counsel” are often used interchangeably, they refer to separate means of investigation. Independent counsels were authorized by Congress in 1978 to provide a mechanism for securing prosecutorial independence in the wake of the Watergate scandal.¹⁰⁰ The law was allowed to lapse in 1999. It is nonetheless worth considering how that mechanism worked, as it highlights some of the limitations of the procedures used to appoint Special Counsel Mueller.

Jurisdiction

The independent counsel’s jurisdiction was established by the appointing judicial panel, which was required to define it broadly enough to cover the matters raised by the attorney general.¹⁰¹

What It Could Do

The independent counsel was granted the “full power and independent authority to exercise all investigative and prosecutorial functions and powers of the Department of Justice, the attorney general, and any other officer or employee of the Department of Justice.”¹⁰² This included “conducting grand jury proceedings and other investigations, participating in civil and criminal court proceedings and litigation, and appealing any decision in any case in which the counsel participates in an official capacity.”¹⁰³ In other words, the independent counsel did not have to seek the attorney general’s approval to make investigatory decisions or initiate a prosecution. The statute also exempted the independent counsel from Department of Justice policies, such as the urgent notifications rules.¹⁰⁴

Who Picked The Investigator

The attorney general conducted a preliminary investigation to determine whether any covered official – essentially, higher level government officials including the president and members of Congress – had violated federal criminal law.¹⁰⁵ This initial investigation unraveled without many typical prosecutorial powers, like the ability to serve subpoenas or to plea bargain. If the attorney general determined that an additional investigation was warranted, she had the discretion to seek the appointment of an independent counsel.¹⁰⁶ The person had to be a government outsider who had “appropriate experience” and would “conduct the investigation and any prosecution in a prompt, responsible, and cost-effective manner” and without undue delay.¹⁰⁷ Three federal appellate judges selected the independent counsel.¹⁰⁸

The attorney general could only remove the independent counsel for “good cause” or “physical or mental disability,” as long as the disability did not fall into a protected category. In addition, the appointing judges could terminate the independent counsel if they determined that the investigation was complete.¹⁰⁹

Strengths

Of all the prosecution models, the independent counsel was best insulated from executive branch influence, because he was appointed by Article III judges and could only be removed by them for cause. The independent counsel also worked completely outside the control of the Justice Department. She had the discretion to choose staff – who were often from the Justice Department and FBI¹¹⁰ – and had a functionally unlimited budget.¹¹¹ However, the independent counsel had to request approval from either the three-judge panel or the attorney general to expand the scope of the investigation, and was subject to a series of reporting requirements to Congress, the three-judge panel, and the general accounting office.

Weaknesses

The disadvantage of insulating the independent counsel from the Justice Department was a lack of accountability. The most famous independent counsel – and the one widely credited for the enabling statute’s eventual demise – was Kenneth Starr, who was initially appointed to investigate the “Whitewater” transaction, a failed real estate transaction involving Bill and Hillary Clinton. The investigation ranged far beyond its initial mandate, most famously extending to Bill Clinton’s extramarital affairs and leading to his impeachment (though not conviction or resignation). Starr’s tenure lasted four and a half years and cost almost \$40 million.¹¹² Ironically, Starr himself criticized the law for enabling unaccountable prosecutors to run amok.¹¹³

V. INDEPENDENT COMMISSION

What It Is

An independent commission is established when Congress passes a law setting up a commission to study a particular issue. The enabling statute sets the boundaries of the commission's investigation. The 9/11 Commission, for example, was tasked with examining and reporting on "the facts and causes relating to the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001," at the World Trade Center, the Pentagon and in Pennsylvania.¹¹⁴

Current Status

Several congressional leaders have called for a panel akin to the 9/11 Commission to look into the allegations of Russian involvement in the election. Sen. Chuck Schumer (D-N.Y.) and House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) recommended that such a group be convened last December; more recently, Rep. Justin Amash (R-Mich.) and Sen. Bill Nelson (D-Fla.) said publicly that they were interested in seeing an independent commission established.¹¹⁵ In mid-May, Rep. Eric Swalwell (D-Calif.) introduced a bill to create a 12-member bipartisan commission, which the Republican majority in the House blocked.¹¹⁶

What It Can Do

Typically, an independent commission would have the power to subpoena witnesses and documents, hold hearings, and request and receive documents from federal agencies.¹¹⁷ The commission would normally be tasked with issuing a report including factual findings, conclusions, and recommendations for the future. It could not pursue criminal charges (although commissions can refer witnesses who refuse to testify for prosecution, requesting a charge of contempt of Congress).

Who Picks The Investigators

In passing a law to establish a commission, Congress would set the rules for determining who serves on the commission or who selects those who serve, and has a fair amount of latitude to express its preferences on the type of participants to be chosen. The 9/11 Commission statute, for instance, entitled President George W. Bush and House and Senate leaders from both parties to select commission members.¹¹⁸ The statute for the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission (FCIC), another recent independent commission, directed the House and Senate Democratic leadership to appoint three members each in consultation with the relevant committees, and the Republican leadership to appoint two members each; none of the members could be governmental employees or members of Congress.¹¹⁹ The statute also expressed the "sense of Congress" that the appointees "should be prominent United States citizens with national recognition and significant depth of experience in such fields as banking, regulation of markets, taxation, finance, economics, consumer protection, and housing."¹²⁰

Strengths

Like a select committee, an independent commission could be designed in way that suits this particular investigation, and its membership could be chosen to make the commission nonpartisan. The latter is a particularly important point in the context of extreme partisanship in Congress and claims from the White House that investigations into Russia are a political witch-hunt. The 10 members of the 9/11 Commission, for example, spanned the ideological spectrum and had strong credentials: Six were former elected public officials, while the remaining four included the former secretary of the Navy, a former deputy attorney general and general counsel to the Department of Defense, a former counsel to President Reagan, and former chief of the Watergate Task Force.¹²¹ Although the report had its critics, the 9/11 Commission is sometimes called the “gold standard of independent federal investigations” for its robust bipartisan process and its unanimous report.¹²²

Weaknesses

It would take time to set up a commission and hire staff members, many of whom would need to go through the lengthy process of obtaining security clearances. The commission would also need enough time and money to carry out a credible investigation. Without those it would be, in the words of the 9/11 Commission’s chair and vice-chair, “set up to fail.”¹²³ The 9/11 Commission, for example, had 80 staff and ultimately cost \$12 million.¹²⁴

Perhaps most critically, legislation establishing a commission would need to be signed by the president at the center of the investigation, who is firmly opposed to its continuation. Federal agencies might also be less likely to cooperate with an independent commission that has no general oversight authority over the agency. The Federal Aviation Authority was so intransigent in response to the 9/11 Commission’s requests for information, for instance, that the commission reversed its initial reluctance to use subpoenas.¹²⁵ While a commission can be given the authority to offer immunity to witnesses as an inducement to testify, doing so raises the same potential complications with respect to ongoing criminal investigations as with standing and select committees.

Finally, an independent commission – which would be entirely untethered from the standing committees – could detract from the longer-term need for Congress to develop strong and continuing oversight capacity.

VI. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE INSPECTOR GENERAL

What It Is

Established by statute to “detect and deter waste, fraud, abuse, and misconduct in DOJ programs and personnel,” the Office of Inspector General (OIG) investigates alleged crimes and civil violations by DOJ employees and audits DOJ programs.¹²⁶ The inspector general is appointed by the president and confirmed by the Senate. He reports to the attorney general and Congress. The current inspector general, Michael E. Horowitz, took office in 2012.

Current Status

A week before President Trump’s inauguration, Horowitz announced that his office would probe Comey’s handling of the FBI investigation into Hillary Clinton’s use of a private email server and possible disclosure of classified information.¹²⁷ Democratic congressional leaders have called on Horowitz to expand the investigation to cover a variety of matters, among them the Trump team’s alleged coordination with Russia, the president’s firing of Comey, and the involvement of Attorney General Jeff Sessions.¹²⁸ The Chairman of the House Oversight Committee Jason Chaffetz (R-Utah) has also asked him to focus on the circumstances surrounding Comey’s termination.¹²⁹ A group of transparency-focused organizations, including the Brennan Center, made a similar request.¹³⁰ The Inspector General’s office has not publicly announced any broadening of the scope of its investigation as of this writing.

What It Can Do

Inspectors general investigate cases, issue reports, and oversee audits of agency programs and operations. The DOJ inspector general does not have prosecutorial powers, but may refer criminal matters to the department’s criminal division for prosecution when there has been a violation of federal law. The inspector general must also inform the attorney general “immediately” when he concludes that there are “serious or flagrant problems” in DOJ operations and programs, and the attorney general must transmit that information to Congress within seven days, along with any comments regarding the inspector general’s findings.¹³¹ Federal officials must comply with OIG information requests and the inspector general may subpoena evidence, though the attorney general has the power (here delegated to his deputy) to refuse information or countermand subpoenas in certain national security matters.¹³² As a practical matter, the latter authority has rarely been exercised.¹³³

Who Picks The Investigators

The Justice Department’s inspector general is appointed by the president and confirmed by the Senate. Under the Inspector General Act of 1978, the president may remove the inspector general, but must give Congress 30 days’ notice before doing so.¹³⁴ A 1977 opinion of the DOJ Office of Legal Counsel

(OLC) concluded that this limitation on the president's authority is unconstitutional¹³⁵ – but it appears this position has never been tested, as there are no public examples of inspectors general being dismissed with less than 30 days' notice.

Strengths

The OIG is the only independent, nonpartisan overseer of the FBI, a component of the Department of Justice not governed by legislative charter. The office has investigated everything from the FBI's use of national security letters to allegations of sexual harassment and whistleblower retaliation.¹³⁶

Weaknesses

The inspector general's office is not as independent as it initially appears. It is still subject to some control by the deputy attorney general, and the inspector general may be removed by the President. Moreover, in recent years the inspector general has complained about the difficulty of obtaining certain types of documents from the FBI – e.g., information produced through grand juries and wiretaps – leading to legislation in December 2016 aiming to address the problem and clarify the scope of the inspector general's authority.¹³⁷

The jurisdiction of the inspector general's office is limited to the Department of Justice, and – while it could cover the dismissal of Comey and the role played by Rosenstein in the matter – it would not extend to many aspects of the Russia investigation. In addition, while the inspector general can subpoena documents from individuals who are no longer DOJ employees due to resignation or retirement, he cannot compel them or White House employees to testify.¹³⁸

CONCLUSION

No particular form of investigation is perfect; each has its strengths and weaknesses. In assessing the best solution for the current situation, it is important to keep in mind the twin goals of ensuring that the American people and their representatives are able to judge the serious allegations that have been leveled, and ensuring that any serious criminal wrongdoing is punished appropriately. The best way to achieve these goals is for Congress to conduct a robust, well-resourced, and nonpartisan investigation, and for Special Counsel Mueller to continue his probe into potential criminal acts, coordinating to manage any potential conflict between their respective mandates.

ENDNOTES

- 1 Chris Kahn, “More Americans want “independent” investigation of Trump: Reuters/Ipsos poll” *Reuters*, May 16, 2017, http://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-trump-poll-idUSKCN18B2LN?utm_campaign=trueAnthem:+Trending+Content&utm_content=591a342004d3017247e59178&utm_medium=trueAnthem&utm_source=twitter (finding that 79% of Democrats and 41% of Republicans polled agree that Congress should conduct an independent investigation into communications between the Russian government and the 2016 Trump campaign); “President Trump and the Trump Administration: Quinnipiac University, May 17-23, 2017,” *PollingReport.com*, http://www.pollingreport.com/trump_ad.htm (finding that 91% of Democrats, 51% of Independents, and 14% of Republicans polled thought that Trump fired Comey in order to disrupt the FBI’s investigation of potential coordination between the Trump campaign and the Russian government).
- 2 Frederick A.O. Schwarz, *Democracy in the Dark: The Seduction of Government Secrecy* (New York: The New Press, 2015), 176.
- 3 Kevin Lamarque, “Senate Intel Committee Gets ‘Blanket’ Subpoena Authority,” *Daily Beast*, May 25, 2017, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/senate-intel-committee-gets-blanket-subpoena-authority?via=desktop&source=copyurl>.
- 4 Select Committee on Intelligence, Report of the Joint Inquiry into the Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001. S. Rep. No. 107-351 and H.R. Rep. No. 107-792, at 1 (2002).
- 5 Michael Keller, “What We Know About Congress’s Russia Investigations,” *Bloomberg Politics*, last updated May 9, 2017, <https://www.bloomberg.com/graphics/2017-russia-investigations/>.
- 6 Byron Tau and Shane Harris, “House Intelligence Panel Issues Seven Subpoenas as Russia Probe Ramps Up,” *Wall Street Journal*, June 1, 2017, <https://www.wsj.com/articles/house-intelligence-committee-said-to-have-issued-seven-subpoenas-in-russia-probe-1496261435>.
- 7 See H.R. Comm. on Oversight & Gov’t Reform, “Oversight Committee Requests All Documents On Flynn’s Foreign Contacts and Payments,” press release, March 22, 2017, <https://oversight.house.gov/release/oversight-committee-requests-documents-flynn-foreign-contacts-payments/>; H.R. Comm. on Oversight & Gov’t Reform, “Chaffetz Responds to FBI Letter Regarding Comey Memos,” press release, May 25, 2017, <https://oversight.house.gov/release/chaffetz-responds-fbi-letter-regarding-comey-memos/>; Derek Hawkins, “Flynn sets record with only 24 days as national security adviser. The average tenure is about 2.6 years,” *Washington Post*, February 14, 2017, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/morning-mix/wp/2017/02/14/flynn-sets-record-with-only-24-days-as-nsc-chief-the-average-tenure-is-about-2-6-years/>.
- 8 Jonathan Landay and Mark Hosenball, “Dispute Erupts over House Panel Subpoenas,” *Reuters*, May 31, 2017, <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-trump-russia-subpoenas-idUSKBN18R33X>.
- 9 Dara Lind, “The Senate’s Trump/Russia investigation is getting serious,” *Vox*, May 10, 2017, <https://www.vox.com/2017/5/10/15619098/flynn-subpoena-senate-trump-russia>; Karoun Demirjian, “Senate Intelligence Committee issues new subpoenas to Flynn’s businesses,” *Washington Post*, May 23, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/powerpost/senate-intelligence-committee-to-consider-interim-steps-against-flynn/2017/05/23/c877f262-3fd3-11e7-adba-394ee67a7582_story.html?utm_term=.349564af49bd.
- 10 Lamarque, “Senate Intel Committee Blanket Subpoena” (see note 3 above).
- 11 Matthew Rosenberg, “6 Takeaways From Monday’s Senate Hearing on Russia,” *New York Times*, May 8, 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/05/08/us/politics/sally-yates-james-clapper-russia-hearing.html>.
- 12 Office of Sen. Richard Burr, “Joint Statement on Committee Inquiry into Russian Intelligence Activities,” press release, January 1, 2017, <https://www.burr.senate.gov/press/releases/joint-statement-on-committee-inquiry-into-russian-intelligence-activities>.

- 13 H.R. Permanent Select Comm. on Intelligence, “Intelligence Committee Chairman, Ranking Member Establish Parameters for Russia Investigation,” press release, March 1, 2017, <http://intelligence.house.gov/news/documentsingle.aspx?DocumentID=767>.
- 14 Office of Sen. Sheldon Whitehouse, “Whitehouse, Graham to Launch Bipartisan Investigation into Russian Influence on Elections,” press release, February 2, 2017, <https://www.whitehouse.senate.gov/news/release/whitehouse-graham-to-launch-bipartisan-investigation-into-russian-influence-on-elections>.
- 15 Ibid.
- 16 The House or Senate may also empower their committees to take sworn depositions, potentially a quicker means of taking testimony. Alissa M. Dolan, et al., Cong. Research Serv., Congressional Oversight Manual, RL30240 (2014), 29, 31-32, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL30240.pdf>.
- 17 Ibid., 27-28, 33.
- 18 Ibid., 34.
- 19 Ibid., 31-32.
- 20 Carl Levin, “OPINION: Congress must press forward with its Russia investigation,” *The Hill*, May 31, 2017, <http://thehill.com/blogs/pundits-blog/the-administration/335560-congress-must-keep-investigating-russias-influence-on> (discussing parallel investigations into the Watergate and Iran-Contra scandals).
- 21 “Committee Members: 115th Congress (2017-2018),” Select Comm. on Intelligence, accessed June 6, 2017, <https://www.intelligence.senate.gov/about/committee-members-115th-congress-2017-2018>; “Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism,” Sen. Comm. on the Judiciary, accessed June 6, 2017, <https://www.judiciary.senate.gov/about/subcommittees/#crime>; “HPSCI Majority Members,” H.R. Permanent Select Comm. on Intelligence, accessed June 6, 2017, <https://intelligence.house.gov/about/hpsci-majority-members.htm> (Four-person majority); “Full Committee,” H.R. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, accessed June 6, 2017, <https://oversight.house.gov/subcommittee/full-committee/> (Six-person majority).
- 22 Carl Levin, “OPINION: Congress must press forward” (see note 20 above).
- 23 Sen. Select Comm. on Intelligence, Committee Study of the CIA’s Detention and Interrogation Program: Findings and Conclusions, accessed June 6, 2017, https://www.feinstein.senate.gov/public/_cache/files/a/9/a992171e-fd27-47bb-8917-5ebe98c72764/7889A5C19ACFE837C78C2192B0876B90.sscistudyfindingsandconclusions.pdf.
- 24 “Timeline of CIA Detention and Interrogation Program,” Office of Sen. Dianne Feinstein, accessed June 5, 2017, https://www.feinstein.senate.gov/public/_cache/files/9/8/9872cc03-b172-42a4-92bf-14c2ddb3d5e0/8E47D9D83EFD48CC86EE0BFB4FD4B9D1.2014-12-08-intelligence-committee-study-timeline.pdf (documenting the Committee’s 9-6 vote on December 13, 2012 to approve the Study as an official Committee report; and their 11-3 vote on April 3, 2014 to send the Study’s executive summary, findings, and conclusions to the White House for declassification review and public release).
- 25 Spencer Ackerman, et al., “Senate Report on CIA Torture Claims Spy Agency Lied About ‘Ineffective’ Program,” *Guardian*, December 9, 2014, <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2014/dec/09/cia-torture-report-released>; Maya Rhodan, “Here’s What Dianne Feinstein Said About the Torture Report,” *Time*, December 9, 2014, <http://time.com/3625560/torture-report-heres-what-dianne-feinstein-said/>.
- 26 *El-Masri v. United States*, 479 F.3d 296 (4th Cir. 2009) (dismissing suit brought by German citizen of Lebanese descent against former CIA Director and US corporations over alleged detention, rendition, and torture under CIA custody due to state secrets privilege); Scott Shane, “No Charges Filed on Harsh Tactics Used by the C.I.A.,” *New York Times*, August 30, 2012, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/08/31/us/holder-rules-out-prosecutions-in-cia-interrogations.html?_r=1&pagewanted=1. (Its release also triggered a new lawsuit that seeks to hold accountable the two psychologists who designed the torture program implemented by the CIA); “Salim v. Mitchell – Lawsuit Against Psychologists Behind CIA Torture Program,” American Civil Liberties Union, accessed June 5, 2017, <https://www.aclu.org/cases/salim-v-mitchell-lawsuit-against-psychologists-behind-cia-torture-program>

- 27 See National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, Pub. L. No. 114-92, 129 Stat 977 § 1045 (2015).
- 28 Henry Waxman, *The Waxman Report: How Congress Really Works* (New York: Hachet Book Group, 2009); David Hoffman and Cass Peterson, “Burford Quits as EPA Administrator,” *Washington Post*, March 10, 1983, https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/1983/03/10/burford-quits-as-epa-administrator/49ef0add-f834-4bef-8fd5-35f13d1f2abd/?utm_term=.010665838851.
- 29 Alyssa Fetini, “The Keating Five,” *Time*, October 8, 2008, <http://content.time.com/time/business/article/0,8599,1848150,00.html>.
- 30 Michael Waldman, *The Fight to Vote* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2016), 193; Dana Milbank, “Maybe Gonzales Won’t Recall His Painful Day on the Hill,” *Washington Post*, April 20, 2007.
- 31 Louis Fisher, Cong. Research Serv., Congressional Access to Executive Branch Information: Legislative Tools, RL30966 (2001), <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/secretary/RL30966.pdf>.
- 32 “Russia’s Role in Election-Year Hacking,” C-SPAN video, January 10, 2017, <https://www.c-span.org/video/?421334-1/senior-intelligence-officials-testify-russia-hacking-activities>.
- 33 Matt Apuzzo, Matthew Rosenberg, and Emmarie Huetteman, “F.B.I. Is Investigating Trump’s Russia Ties, Comey Confirms,” *New York Times*, March 20, 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/20/us/politics/fbi-investigation-trump-russia-comey.html>.
- 34 Rosenberg, “6 Takeaways From Monday’s Senate Hearing on Russia” (see note 11 above).
- 35 Del Quentin Wilber, “Comey to Testify That Trump Asked Him to Back Off Flynn Investigation,” *Wall Street Journal*, May 31, 2017, <https://www.wsj.com/articles/comey-to-testify-publicly-before-senate-intelligence-committee-1496255738>.
- 36 Adam Goldman and Michael Schwirtz, “Michael Flynn Was Paid By Russian-Linked Firms, Letter Shows,” *New York Times*, March 16, 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/16/us/politics/michael-flynn-russia-paid-trip.html>; Karoun Demirjian, “Flynn probably broke the law by failing to disclose foreign payments, House Oversight leaders say,” *Washington Post*, April 25, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/powerpost/flynn-likely-broke-the-law-by-failing-to-disclose-foreign-payments-house-committee-says/2017/04/25/249fc22c-29cc-11e7-a616-d7c8a68c1a66_story.html.
- 37 Greg Miller and Adam Entous, “Trump administration sought to enlist intelligence officials, key lawmakers to counter Russia stories,” *Washington Post*, February 24, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/trump-administration-sought-to-enlist-intelligence-officials-key-lawmakers-to-counter-russia-stories/2017/02/24/c8487552-fa99-11e6-be05-1a3817ac21a5_story.html.
- 38 Amber Phillips, “The Devin Nunes wiretapping saga, explained,” *Washington Post*, March 28, 2017, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2017/03/28/the-devin-nunes-wiretapping-saga-explained/>; “Still No Evidence, Mr. President,” FactCheck.Org, March 23, 2017, <http://www.factcheck.org/2017/03/still-no-evidence-mr-president/>.
- 39 The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, “President Donald J. Trump Announces Judicial Candidate Nominations,” press release, May 8, 2017, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/05/08/president-donald-j-trump-announces-judicial-candidate-nominations>.
- 40 Jessica Schulberg, “Senate Intelligence Committee Divided On Whether It Has Enough Staff To Pull Off Russia Investigation,” *Huffington Post*, April 27, 2017, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/senate-intelligence-russia-probe-more-staff_us_590283b4e4b0bb2d086c620a; Dustin Volz, “Senate gives limited resources to Russia election-meddling probe,” *Reuters*, April 25, 2017, <http://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-trump-russia-congress-idUSKBN17R05E>.
- 41 See S. Res. 400, 94th Cong., 2d Sess., 122 Cong. Rec. 14,673, 14,673-75 (1976) (as amended through 2014) (Senate intelligence committee authority); Rules of the House of Representatives, 115th Cong., Rule X (11) (2017),

<https://rules.house.gov/sites/republicans.rules.house.gov/files/115/PDF/House-Rules-115.pdf> (House intelligence committee authority).

- 42 Susan Hennessey and Benjamin Wittes, “It’s Time for a Select Committee on Russia (Also, We Told You So),” *Lawfare* (blog), March 23, 2017, <https://www.lawfareblog.com/its-time-select-committee-russia-also-we-told-you-so>; Julian Sanchez, “A Misplaced Focus on ‘Collusion,’” *Just Security* (blog), May 12, 2017, <https://www.justsecurity.org/40870/misplaced-focus-collusion/> (arguing that it is unlikely that an investigation will uncover evidence of collusion, but that there may be other kinds of misconduct the public should be aware of).
- 43 Office of Sen. Richard Burr, “Joint Statement on Committee Inquiry” (see note 12 above).
- 44 Karoun Demirjian, “Flynn to hand over documents in response to Senate panel’s subpoena,” *Washington Post*, May 30, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/powerpost/flynn-to-hand-over-documents-in-response-to-senate-panels-subpoena/2017/05/30/40ad52ae-4588-11e7-a196-a1bb629f64cb_story.html.
- 45 Adam Entous and Ellen Nakashima, “Flynn offers to cooperate with congressional probe in exchange for immunity,” *Washington Post*, March 31, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/flynn-offers-to-cooperate-with-congressional-probe-in-exchange-for-immunity/2017/03/30/bfd48584-159f-11e7-ada0-1489b735b3a3_story.html; Barry Meier and Jesse Drucker, “Russian Once Tied to Trump Aide Seeks Immunity to Cooperate With Congress,” *New York Times*, May 26, 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/05/26/us/politics/oleg-deripaska-paul-manafort.html>.
- 46 Dolan et al., Congressional Oversight Manual, 31-32 (see note 16 above).
- 47 See for example “Understanding the Iran-Contra Affairs: The Legal Aftermath,” Brown University, accessed June 7, 2017, https://www.brown.edu/Research/Understanding_the_Iran_Contra_Affair/prosecutions.php (showing that 8 out of 14 of the individuals prosecuted for their involvement were pardoned and/or had their sentences overturned).
- 48 Ken Dilanian, “Comey ‘Cleared for Takeoff’ in Public Testimony Next Week,” *NBC News*, May 31, 2017, <http://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/comey-testify-public-next-week-n766741>.
- 49 Levin, OPINION: “Congress must press forward.” (see note 20 above).
- 50 Valerie Heitshusen, Cong. Research Serv., Committee Types and Roles, 98-241 (2017), 2-3 <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/98-241.pdf>.
- 51 H.R. Res. 36, 113th Cong. (2013) (establishing a select committee to investigate and report on the attack on the United States consulate in Benghazi, Libya).
- 52 Office of Sen. Jack Reed, “Schumer, McCain, Reed, Graham Request Support For New Senate Select Committee on Cyber Security,” press release, December 18, 2016, <https://www.reed.senate.gov/news/releases/schumer-mccain-reed-graham>.
- 53 Office of Sen. John McCain, “Statement by Senator John McCain on Dismissal of FBI Director James Comey,” press release, May 9, 2017, <https://www.mccain.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/2017/5/statement-by-senator-john-mccain-on-dismissal-of-fbi-director-james-comey>.
- 54 H.R. Res. 36, 113th Cong. § 3 (see note 51 above).
- 55 Dolan et al., Congressional Oversight Manual, 60-70 (see note 16 above). Frederick M. Kaiser et al., Cong. Research Serv., Congressional Oversight Manual, RL30240 (2011), 74, <https://www.scribd.com/document/47115779/Congressional-Oversight-Manual>.
- 56 S. Res. 23, 100th Cong. § 5 (1987).
- 57 Report of the Congressional Committees Investigating the Iran-Contra Affair, H.R. Rep. No. 433, 100th Cong., 1st Sess. 690 (1987).

- 58 However, as a practical matter, any attempt to pass the resolution in the Senate would require a two-thirds majority to overcome a filibuster. Richard S. Beth et al., Cong. Research Serv., *Filibusters and Cloture in the Senate*, RL30360 (2014), <https://www.senate.gov/CRSPubs/3d51be23-64f8-448e-aa14-10ef0f94b77e.pdf>
- 59 S. Res. 60, 93d Cong. § 1 (1973).
- 60 H.R. Res. 36, 113th Cong. (see note 51 above).
- 61 Schwarz, *Democracy in the Dark*, 175-183 (see note 2 above).
- 62 Loch K. Johnson, *A Season of Inquiry: The Church Committee Confronts America's Spy Agencies* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2015), 9.
- 63 S.Res. 21, 94th Cong. § 2, https://www.senate.gov/artandhistory/history/common/investigations/pdf/ChurchCommittee_SRes21.pdf (emphasis added).
- 64 Johnson, *A Season of Inquiry*, 1.
- 65 Only in rare instances have resolutions gone further, requiring select committees to have equal representation from each party. See Authority and Rules of Senate Special Investigatory Committees and Other Senate Entities, 1973-97, S. Doc. No. 105-16, at IV-V, <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CDOC-105sdoc16/pdf/CDOC-105sdoc16.pdf> (discussing the Abscam and POW/MIA Affairs committees).
- 66 David Weigel, “Boehner’s likely successor credits Benghazi committee for lowering Hillary Clinton’s poll numbers,” *Washington Post*, September 30, 2015, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2015/09/30/boehners-likely-successor-credits-benghazi-committee-for-lowering-hillary-clintons-poll-numbers/?tid=ai&utm_term=.7f2c2e01bf02.
- 67 Carl Levin, “Church Committee demonstrated value of bipartisan oversight,” *Hill*, November 5, 2015, <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/lawmaker-news/259134-church-committee-demonstrated-value-of-bipartisan-oversight>.
- 68 Johnson, *A Season of Inquiry* 269, 271; Marc B. Langston, “Rediscovering Congressional Intelligence Oversight: Is Another Church Committee Possible Without Frank Church?” *Texas A&M Law Review* 2 (2015): 453.
- 69 Johnson, *A Season of Inquiry* 271, 272.
- 70 Senate Select Comm. on Presidential Campaign Activities v. Nixon, 498 F.2d 725, 726 (D.C. Cir. 1974).
- 71 Scott Armstrong, “What to Remember About Watergate,” *New York Times*, May 20, 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/05/20/opinion/sunday/trump-nixon-watergate-congress.html>; John Dean, *Blind Ambition: The White House Years* (New York: Simon & Schuster 1976) (“Baker was shocked that I knew about his meeting with Nixon, but he played it cool as a cucumber.”), 303.
- 72 When Nixon sought to block special prosecutor Archibald Cox from pursuing the matter, he concocted a compromise that was blessed by Senator Sam Ervin (D-NC), the chair, and Senator Baker (R-TN), the vice-chair. Nixon would provide summaries of the tapes to be verified by 71 year-old John Stennis, an ardent Nixon supporter who was, alas, profoundly deaf. The Stennis deal fell apart on October 20, 1973, resulting in the Saturday Night Massacre. Glen Elsasser and Harry Kelly, “Nixon, Cox Clash on Tapes,” *Chicago Tribune*, October 20, 1973, <http://archives.chicagotribune.com/1973/10/20/page/17/article/nixon-cox-clash-on-tapes>; Ken Gormley, “The Saturday Night Massacre, How Our Constitution Trumped a Reckless President,” *Constitution Daily* (blog), October 20, 2015, <https://constitutioncenter.org/blog/the-saturday-night-massacre-40-years-later-how-our-constitution-trumped-a-r>.
- 73 Scott Armstrong, “What to Remember About Watergate,” *New York Times*, May 20, 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/05/20/opinion/sunday/trump-nixon-watergate-congress.html>; Senate Select Comm. on Presidential Campaign Activities v. Nixon, 498 F.2d 725 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

- 74 See *United States v. Nixon*, 418 U.S. 683 (1974).
- 75 “The Smoking Gun Tape,” Watergate.info, accessed June 6, 2017, <http://watergate.info/1972/06/23/the-smoking-gun-tape.html>.
- 76 28 C.F.R. § 600.8 (2016) (“A Special Counsel shall be provided all appropriate resources by the Department of Justice. Within the first 60 days of his or her appointment, the Special Counsel shall develop a proposed budget for the current fiscal year with the assistance of the Justice Management Division for the Attorney General’s review and approval. Based on the proposal, the Attorney General shall establish a budget for the operations of the Special Counsel. The budget shall include a request for assignment of personnel, with a description of the qualifications needed.”).
- 77 28 C.F.R. Part 600, §§600.1 to 600.10 (2016); Neal Katyal, “Trump or Congress Can Still Block Robert Mueller. I Know. I Wrote the Rules,” *Washington Post*, May 19, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2017/05/19/politics-could-still-block-muellers-investigation-i-know-i-wrote-the-rules/?utm_term=.a45078fb51b3.
- 78 28 C.F.R. § 600.3 (2016).
- 79 28 C.F.R. § 600.5 (2016).
- 80 28 C.F.R. § 600.7 (2016).
- 81 Rod J. Rosenstein, Acting Attorney General, Order No. 3915-2017, “Appointment of Special Counsel to Investigate Russian Interference With the 2016 Presidential Election and Related Matters,” May 17, 2017, <http://s3.documentcloud.org/documents/3726373/Rosenstein-Order.pdf>; 28 C.F.R. § 600.4 (2016).
- 82 28 C.F.R. § 600.4 (2016).
- 83 28 C.F.R. § 600.6 (2016).
- 84 Charlie Savage, “How a Special Counsel Alters the Russia Investigation,” *New York Times*, May 17, 2017, https://www.nytimes.com/2017/05/17/us/politics/special-counsel-in-russia-investigation-raises-stakes-for-trump.html?_r=0.
- 85 Karoun Demirjian et al., “Attorney General Jeff Sessions Will Recuse Himself from Any Probe Related to 2016 Presidential Campaign,” *Washington Post*, March 2, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/powerpost/top-gop-lawmaker-calls-on-sessions-to-recuse-himself-from-russia-investigation/2017/03/02/148c07ac-ff46-11e6-8ebe-6e0dbe4f2bca_story.html?utm_term=.44e53da0f1c4.
- 86 “Special Counsel Q&A,” FactCheck.Org, last modified May 19, 2017, accessed June 6, 2017, <http://www.factcheck.org/2017/05/special-counsel-qa/>.
- 87 28 C.F.R. 600.6 (2016).
- 88 James Comey, Deputy Attorney General, and Christopher Ray, Assistant Attorney General, “Appointment of a Special Prosecutor to Oversee the Alleged Leak of CIA Agent Identity and Recusal of Attorney General Ashcroft from the Investigation,” press conference, December 30, 2003, <https://fas.org/irp/news/2003/12/doj123003.html>.
- 89 Offices of the United States Attorneys, *United States Attorneys’ Manual* (United States Department of Justice, 2011), §1-13.100, <https://www.justice.gov/usam/usam-1-13000-urgent-reports>.
- 90 [28 C.F.R. § 600.9 \(2016\)](#).
- 91 Jack Maskell, Cong. Research Serv., Independent Counsels, Special Prosecutors, Special Counsels, and the Role of Congress, R43112 (2013), 3-4, <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R43112.pdf>.
- 92 Nathan Layne et al., “Exclusive: Special Counsel Mueller to Probe Ex-Trump Aide Flynn’s Turkey Ties,” *Reuters*, June 2, 2017, <http://mobile.reuters.com/article/idUSKBN18T276?il=0>.

- 93 Charlie Savage, “Deputy Attorney General’s Memo Breaks Down Case Against Comey,” *New York Times*, May 9, 2017, https://www.nytimes.com/2017/05/09/us/politics/comey-fbi-memo-rod-rosenstein.html?_r=0.
- 94 Sari Horwitz et al., “Rosenstein Defends His Controversial Memo Used to Justify Trump’s Firing of Comey,” *Washington Post*, May 19, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/powerpost/rosenstein-heads-back-to-capitol-hill-friday-to-brief-house-members/2017/05/19/e205b3f8-3c8c-11e7-9e48-c4f199710b69_story.html?utm_term=.ff9f6d9dd4d2.
- 95 Katyal, “Trump or Congress Can Still Block Robert Mueller” (see note 77 above); Josh Blackman, “Could Trump Remove Special Counsel Robert Mueller? Lessons from Watergate,” *Lawfare* (blog), May 23, 2017, <https://www.lawfareblog.com/could-trump-remove-special-counsel-robert-mueller-lessons-watergate>.
- 96 28 U.S.C. § 510 (2012) (“The Attorney General may from time to time make such provisions as he considers appropriate authorizing the performance by any other officer, employee, or agency of the Department of Justice of any function of the Attorney General”); Government’s Response to Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss the Indictment at 2, *United States v. Libby*, 461 F.Supp.2d 3 (D.D.C. 2006) (No. 05-394 (RBW)), ECF No. 67-1, https://www.justice.gov/archive/osc/documents/2006_03_17_governments_response_to_motion_to_dismiss.pdf (internal quotes and citations removed).
- 97 At the time, Comey said: “[Fitzgerald] does not have to come back to me for anything ... [he has] all the approval authority that I as attorney general have.” Comey, “Appointment of a Special Prosecutor” (see note 88 above).
- 98 *Ibid.*
- 99 *Ibid.*; Josh Blackman, “Could Trump Remove Special Counsel” (see note 99 above).
- 100 Jim Mokhiber, “Secrets of an Independent Counsel: A Brief History of the Independent Counsel Law,” *PBS*, May 1998, <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/counsel/office/history.html>.
- 101 28 U.S.C. § 593(b) (2012).
- 102 *Morrison v. Olson*, 487 U.S. 654, 662 (1988).
- 103 *Id.*
- 104 *Id.* at, 655.
- 105 28 U.S.C. § 591 (2012); Mokhiber, “A Brief History of the Independent Counsel Law.”
- 106 28 U.S.C. § 592 (2012).
- 107 28 U.S.C. § 593(b)(2) (2012).
- 108 28 U.S.C. § 593 (2012); 28 U.S.C. § 49 (2012).
- 109 28 U.S.C. § 596(a)-(b) (2012).
- 110 Mokhiber, “A Brief History of the Independent Counsel Law” (see note 100 above).
- 111 “Independent Probes of Clinton Administration Cost Nearly \$80 Million,” *CNN*, April 1, 1999, <http://edition.cnn.com/ALLPOLITICS/stories/1999/04/01/counsel.probe.costs/>; Robert Dole et al., *Project on the Independent Counsel Statute: Report and Recommendations*, American Enterprise Institute & Brookings Institution, 1999, 16.
- 112 “Independent Probes of Clinton Administration,” *CNN*.
- 113 Roberto Suro and Guy Gugliotta, “Starr to Oppose Counsel Statute,” *Washington Post*, April 14, 1999, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/special/clinton/stories/starr041499.htm>.

- 114 Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, Pub. L. No. 107-306, 116 Stat. 2408 (2002).
- 115 “Top Dems Call for ‘9/11 Commission’-Style Meetings on Russia Hacks,” *Fox News*, December 13, 2016, <http://insider.foxnews.com/2016/12/13/herridge-democrats-schumer-pelosi-911-commission-meeting-russian-hacking-election-trump>; Justin Amash’s Twitter feed, accessed June 6, 2017, <https://twitter.com/justinamash/status/862089192603607041>; Bill Nelson’s Twitter feed, accessed June 6, 2016, <https://twitter.com/SenBillNelson/status/862072357782990849>.
- 116 Protecting Our Democracy Act, H.R. 356, 115th Cong. (2017); Nicole Gaudiano, “GOP Blocks House Vote on Independent Russia-Trump Investigation,” *USA Today*, May 17, 2017, <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2017/05/17/gop-blocks-house-vote-independent-russia-trump-probe/101796632/>.
- 117 See Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, Pub. L. No. 107-306, 116 Stat. 2408-09 (2002).
- 118 Ibid.
- 119 Fraud Enforcement and Recovery Act of 2009, Pub. L. No. 111-21, 123 Stat. 1617, 1625-26 (2009).
- 120 Ibid. at 1626.
- 121 Biographical Information of Commission Members, National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States, accessed June 6, 2017, <http://govinfo.library.unt.edu/911/about/bios.htm>.
- 122 Philip Shenon, “So You Want to Investigate Donald Trump...,” *Politico*, March 23, 2017, <http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2017/03/devin-nunes-surveillance-donald-trump-investigation-214946>. Some observers have noted that the commission allowed individual participants in the debacle to evade accountability (along with individuals who lied to the commission during the investigative process), and a number of its report’s recommendations were never followed through on, a matter of some distress to the committee’s co-chairs. *Tenth Anniversary Report Card: The Status of the 9/11 Commission Recommendations*, Bipartisan Policy Center, 2011, <http://bipartisanpolicy.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/default/files/CommissionRecommendations.pdf>. In addition, many of the recommendations that were implemented – including fusion centers, Suspicious Activities Reports, and the “See Something Say Something” initiative – have been roundly criticized for being ineffective, counterproductive, and/or violative of civil rights and civil liberties. See, e.g., Michael Price, *National Security and Local Police*, Brennan Center for Justice, 2013, 12-14, https://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/publications/NationalSecurity_LocalPolice_web.pdf.
- 123 Dana Milbank, “With Abysmal GPA, Government Fails to Make Kean’s List,” *Washington Post*, December 6, 2005, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/12/05/AR2005120501933.html>.
- 124 Erik Ortiz, “How Can Congress Set up an Independent Commission to Investigate Russia?,” *NBC News*, March 29, 2017, <http://www.nbcnews.com/politics/congress/how-can-congress-set-independent-commission-investigate-russia-n739536>.
- 125 Philip Shenon, “9/11 Commission Could Subpoena Oval Office Files,” *New York Times*, October 26, 2003, <http://www.nytimes.com/2003/10/26/us/9-11-commission-could-subpoena-oval-office-files.html>.
- 126 “About the Office,” Office of the Inspector General, U.S. Department of Justice, last modified May 2017, <https://oig.justice.gov/about/>.
- 127 Matt Zapposky & Sari Horwitz, “Justice Department Inspector General to Investigate Pre-Election Actions by Department and FBI,” *Washington Post*, January 12, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-nation/wp/2017/01/12/justice-department-inspector-general-to-investigate-pre-election-actions-by-department-and-fbi/?utm_term=.3c95a17712ff.
- 128 Jordain Carney, “Dem Senators to DOJ: Investigate if Trump Interfered in FBI’s Russia Probe,” *Hill*, May 12, 2017, <http://thehill.com/blogs/floor-action/senate/333130-dem-senators-to-doj-investigate-if-trump-interfered-in-fbis-russia>; Seung Min Kim, “Schumer Calls for DOJ Watchdog to Probe Trump-Russia Investigation,” *Politico*, March 6, 2017, <http://www.politico.com/story/2017/03/chuck-schumer-justice-watchdog-trump-russia-235717>.

- 129 Kathryn Watson, “Chaffetz Asks Justice Dept. Watchdog to Expand Investigation to Include Comey Firing,” *CBS News*, May 10, 2017, <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/jason-chaffetz-asks-justice-department-watchdog-to-expand-investigation-to-include-comey-firing/>.
- 130 “Groups Urge DOJ Inspector General to Investigate Senior Officials’ Possible Misconduct in Comey Firing,” Brennan Center for Justice, press release, May 31, 2017, <http://www.brennancenter.org/press-release/groups-urge-doj-inspector-general-investigate-senior-officials-possible-misconduct>.
- 131 Inspector General Act of 1978, 5 U.S.C App. 3 §5(d) (2016).
- 132 *Ibid.* at §§ 6, 8E.
- 133 Benjamin S. Mishkin, “Filling the Oversight Gap: The Case for Local Intelligence Oversight,” *N.Y.U. Law Review* 88 (2013): 1433–34; Shirin Sinnar, Protecting Rights from Within? Inspectors General and National Security Oversight, *Stanford Law Review* 65 (2013): 1036.
- 134 Inspector General Act of 1978, 5 U.S.C App. 3 § 3 (2016).
- 135 Rick Hills, “Can President Trump Fire the DOJ Inspector General without Waiting Thirty Days After Giving Congress a Reason?,” *PrawfsBlawg* (blog), January 12, 2017, <http://prawfsblawg.blogs.com/prawfsblawg/2017/01/can-trump-fire-the-doj-inspector-general-without-giving-congress-a-reason.html>.
- 136 Office of the Inspector General Oversight and Review Division, *A Review of the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s Use of National Security Letters: Assessment of Progress in Implementing Recommendations and Examination of Use in 2007 through 2009* (U.S. Department of Justice, August 2014), <https://oig.justice.gov/reports/2014/s1408.pdf>; see generally *Cowley v. Lynch*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 111264, 2015 WL 5020891 (E.D. Va. Aug. 21, 2015).
- 137 *‘All’ Means ‘All’: The Justice Department’s Failure to Comply With Its Legal Obligation to Ensure Inspector General Access to All Records Needed For Independent Oversight; Hearing Before the S. Comm. on the Judiciary*, 114th Cong. (2015) (statement of Michael E. Horowitz, Inspector General, U.S. Department of Justice), <https://oig.justice.gov/testimony/t150805.pdf>; Inspector General Empowerment Act of 2016, Pub. L. No. 114-317, 114 Stat. (2016).
- 138 *Improving the Efficiency, Effectiveness, and Independence of Inspectors General; Hearing Before the S. Comm. on Homeland Security & Governmental Affairs*, 114th Cong. (2015) (statement of Michael E. Horowitz, Inspector General, U.S. Department of Justice, at 7), <https://oig.justice.gov/testimony/t150224.pdf>.

STAY CONNECTED TO THE BRENNAN CENTER

Visit our website at www.brennancenter.org.
Sign up for our electronic newsletters at www.brennancenter.org/signup.

Latest News | Up-to-the-minute information on our work, publications, events and more.

Justice Update | Snapshot of our justice work and latest developments in the field.

Fair Courts | Comprehensive news roundup spotlighting judges and the courts.

Money in Politics | Latest state and national developments and original analysis.

Redistricting Round-Up | Analysis of current legal battles and legislative efforts.

Liberty & National Security | Updates on privacy, government oversight, and accountability.

Twitter | www.twitter.com/BrennanCenter
Facebook | www.facebook.com/BrennanCenter
Instagram | www.instagram.com/BrennanCenter

NEW AND FORTHCOMING BRENNAN CENTER PUBLICATIONS

How Many Americans Are Unnecessarily Incarcerated?
Dr. James Austin and Lauren-Brooke Eisen with James Cullen and Jonathan Frank

Crime Trends: 1990-2016
Matthew Friedman, Ames C. Grawert, and James Cullen

What Caused the Crime Decline?
Dr. Oliver Roeder, Lauren-Brooke Eisen, and Julia Bowling

Democracy & Justice: Collected Writings, Vol. X
The Brennan Center for Justice

Countering Violent Extremism
Faiza Patel and Meghan Koushik

Election Integrity: A Pro-Voter Agenda
Myrna Perez

The New Era of Secret Law
Elizabeth Goitein

For more information, please visit www.brennancenter.org.

BRENNAN
CENTER
FOR JUSTICE
TWENTY
YEARS

at New York University School of Law

120 Broadway
Suite 1750
New York, NY 10271
646-292-8310
www.brennancenter.org