

**Statement of Senator Chuck Grassley of Iowa
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary
Executive Business Meeting
February 5, 2015**

Last week, the Committee held the hearing for Ms. Lynch to serve as U.S. Attorney General. I was pleased that Senators were able to ask all the questions that they wanted.

I know it was a bit hectic with all of the votes on the Floor. So I appreciated everyone's flexibility.

As a reminder to all Senators, written questions for Ms. Lynch need to be submitted by the end of the day today. I assume Ms. Lynch will work diligently to provide answers to those questions by next week. And after she provides them, the plan would be to follow regular order and list the nomination on the agenda.

At that point, I'm confident I'll have a request to hold the nomination over until our next Executive meeting, which I will of course honor at that time. That should provide Senators and their staffs enough time to review Ms. Lynch's answers to written questions.

Let me add one additional point regarding Ms. Lynch and Questions for the Record.

At her hearing, Ms. Lynch provided more responses, than she did answers. So, I hope she'll answer our written questions in a more direct and responsive way than she answered questions during her hearing.

With that in mind, let me say that while I certainly hope we won't need to send Ms. Lynch follow-up questions seeking additional clarity, I wouldn't be surprised if some Senators, perhaps myself included, don't find her initial answers adequate.

If any of you aren't satisfied with Ms. Lynch's answers, then you need to send your follow-up questions within a day or two after she submits her response.

I'll hold myself to that standard as well.

So, let me conclude by saying that while I recognize this timeline isn't as rapid as some would like, I'm going to continue to follow regular order so this nomination is considered in a thorough but fair way.

With that, I'll turn to the legislation on the agenda.

There are two bills appearing on the agenda for the first time.

The first is S. 337, the FOIA Improvement Act of 2015. Senators Cornyn and Leahy have worked on this bill for well over a year. In fact, last year this bill passed the Senate by

unanimous consent. That's not an easy task. Unfortunately, time ran out at the end of the year and we were unable to send a FOIA bill to the President.

Today, we're picking up from where we left off last year. I'm hopeful we can get something to the President for his signature.

I'm proud to cosponsor S. 337 as it will increase government transparency and accountability. Once again, thank you Senators Leahy and Cornyn for your hard work on this bill.

Next, I am pleased to support S.295, the Amy and Vicky Child Pornography Victim Restitution Improvement Act which has been cosponsored by 14 members of this Committee, including myself. Victims of child pornography should receive full restitution for their losses, contrary to what the Supreme Court ruled last year.

I congratulate Senator Hatch for his work on this important bill.

Turning back to the legislation, I'm prepared to voice vote both, unless there's a request for a roll call vote.

First up is S. 337, the FOIA Improvement Act of 2015. Are there any members who wish to speak before we vote?

Next, I call up S. 295, the Amy and Vicky Child Pornography Victim Restitution Improvement Act of 2015. Are there any members who wish to speak?

There are also three nominations on today's agenda:

- Michael Botticelli to be Director of National Drug Control Policy.
- Jeanne Davidson, to be a Judge of the United States Court of International Trade
- And Daniel Marti to be Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator, Executive Office of the President.

There's a request on our side to hold over Mr. Marti.

I believe both the Davidson and Botticelli nominations can be voice voted.

However, before we vote on the Davidson nomination, I wanted to note that recently unsealed court documents in the case of *Dobyns v. United States* have prompted some questions that need to be answered. I want to follow up with her regarding the extent of her involvement in the case. So we'll report her out today, but I'll be sending her some additional questions that will need to be answered before her nomination is considered on the floor.

With that, I'll move to both nominations.