



Updated May 26, 2020

# Removal of Inspectors General: Rules, Practice, and Considerations for Congress

## Introduction

In 1978, Congress passed the Inspector General Act (IG Act; P.L. 95-452) with the intent to improve oversight within certain executive branch agencies. During the floor debate on the legislation, Senator Thomas Eagleton described independence as the “most important” characteristic of the inspectors general (*Congressional Record*, vol. 124, part 29, October 22, 1978, p. 30952). While this independence has been considered essential, it is also weighed against the fact that inspectors general are situated within the agencies and that their dual mission is to report to both their home agencies and Congress, which calls for consideration of the balance between independence from and general supervision by agencies.

The removal procedures for inspectors general, which fall between removal without limitations and removal only for cause, have been considered an integral element of that independence since 1978. Nonetheless, there have been some instances in which Presidents have removed inspectors general, and those actions have raised concerns in Congress. In addition, Congress has considered and enacted additional removal requirements since 1978.

This In Focus provides an overview of the current removal procedure for inspectors general, identifies some notable removals, and discusses potential issues for Congress.

## Removal Procedure

The removal procedure for presidentially appointed inspectors general is found in Section 3(b) of the IG Act (5 U.S.C. Appendix, as amended). The section reads:

An Inspector General may be removed from office by the President. If an Inspector General is removed from office or is transferred to another position or location within an establishment, the President shall communicate in writing the reasons for any such removal or transfer to both Houses of Congress, not later than 30 days before the removal or transfer. Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit a personnel action otherwise authorized by law, other than transfer or removal.

For the inspectors general of designated federal entities (DFEs), which are listed in Section 8G(2) of the IG Act, the same notice rule applies, except that the head of the DFE, rather than President, appoints and removes the inspector general. For DFEs headed by boards, committees, or commissions, removal requires the written concurrence of two-thirds of the members. The inspector general for the U.S. Postal Service may be removed only with agreement of seven out of nine postal governors and only “for cause.”

The 30-day notice requirement was established under the Inspector General Reform Act of 2008 (P.L. 110-409). Previously, the President (or head of a DFE) was required to “communicate the reasons for any such removal to both Houses of Congress” but not to provide advance notice.

Acting inspectors general, some of whom have served in this capacity for years at a time, may not enjoy the same removal protections as confirmed inspectors general. The status of acting inspectors general in positions subject to Senate confirmation is dictated by the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998 (5 U.S.C. §§3345-3349c; see CRS Report R44997, *The Vacancies Act: A Legal Overview*, by Valerie C. Brannon).

For a more detailed analysis of the development and implementation of this legal framework, see CRS Legal Sidebar LSB10476, *Presidential Removal of IGs Under the Inspector General Act*, by Todd Garvey.

## Removal Practice

This section discusses presidential removals of inspectors general and examples of related congressional practice.

### President Reagan’s Removal of All Inspectors General

One of President Reagan’s first official acts upon his inauguration on January 20, 1981, was to remove all 15 confirmed and acting inspectors general then working across the executive branch. This action appears to have caused bipartisan concern in Congress. On February 3, 1981, an article in the *New York Times* quoted Representatives L. H. Fountain and Frank Horton, the chairperson and ranking member of the House Committee on Government Operations, respectively, as saying that the move had the potential to politicize, and thereby undermine, the position of inspector general (Robert Pear, “Ouster of All Inspectors General by Reagan Called Political Move,” *New York Times*, February 3, 1981, p. B14).

The controversy dissipated after President Reagan’s nominees met with the approval of Congress. By the time the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations and Human Resources of the House Committee on Government Operations held a hearing on April 1, 1981, Chairperson Fountain stated that his concerns had been eased by the fact that five of the former inspectors general had been renominated and the Administration had made other commitments to support the inspector general system.

Chairperson Fountain, though, also described the impact of the removals:

This action undoubtedly had an adverse effect on the operations of the offices whose directors were abruptly removed. Much more serious damage was done, however, by the perception that Inspectors General were being viewed in the same light as political appointees, who expect to be removed with each change in administrations (U.S. Congress, House Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations and Human Resources, *Oversight of Offices of Inspector General*, 97<sup>th</sup> Cong., 1<sup>st</sup> sess., April 1, 1981, pp. 1-2).

As this comment illustrates, some considered removal protections to be a part of the organizational design of the offices of inspectors general, ensuring that they could perform their duties free of the perception that they are partisan political actors.

### Presidential Transitions after Reagan

During presidential transitions, turnover of political appointees is particularly common. While new Presidents have the authority to remove inspectors general at the start of their Administrations and make their own nominations, as they do for appointees in many other positions, this has generally not been the practice.

Following the actions at the beginning of the Reagan Administration, some Members of Congress were proactive in informing new administrations that they expected inspectors general to remain in their positions notwithstanding the change in Administration. For instance, in both 1988 and 1992, Senators John Glenn and William Roth, the chair and vice chair of the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs, sent letters to Presidents-elect George H. W. Bush and Bill Clinton emphasizing this position. Since 1981, inspectors general have remained in their positions during each presidential transition.

### Recent Presidential Removals of Inspectors General

There are also at least three instances of a President acting to remove an inspector general since 2008:

- On June 11, 2009, President Barack Obama notified Congress that he was removing the inspector general of the Corporation for National Community Service, Gerald Walpin. President Obama's stated reason for Walpin's removal was that he no longer had "the fullest confidence" in Walpin (letter from Barack Obama to Nancy Pelosi, June 11, 2009).
- On April 3, 2020, President Donald Trump notified Congress that he was removing the inspector general of the Intelligence Community, Michael Atkinson, because he no longer had the "fullest confidence" in Atkinson (letter from Donald Trump, to Senators Richard Burr and Mark Warner, April 3, 2020). The removal requirements for the inspector general for the Intelligence Community are under Title 50, Section 3033(c)(4), of the *United States Code*, which has the same requirements as the IG Act.

- On May 15, 2020, President Trump notified Congress that he intends to remove inspector general for the State Department, Steven Linick, because he no longer had the "fullest confidence" in Linick (letter from Donald Trump, to Speaker Nancy Pelosi, May 15, 2020). As of this writing the 30-day notice window has not elapsed.

In each case, legislators have objected to the lack of specificity in these notices (see, for example, letter from Senator Chuck Grassley et al. to Donald Trump, April 8, 2020). Senators received more information from the Obama Administration (letter from Norm Eisen, Special Counsel for Ethics and Government Reform, to Senators Joseph Lieberman and Susan Collins, June 16, 2009).

It may be the case that other inspectors general have resigned under threat of removal since 1978. Because it is not possible to describe these cases with certainty from the publicly available materials, they are not discussed here. Nonetheless, because such actions may impact the independence of inspectors general, Congress may monitor or investigate reports of such incidents.

### Considerations for Congress

The removal of inspectors general has remained a topic of interest for Congress since 1978. Below are some aspects of the issue that Congress may consider.

#### Effectiveness of the Current Procedure

As an initial step, it may be useful to consider whether the current removal procedure provides for the desired independence and performance from inspectors general. If Congress has concerns about how inspectors general are operating, it may also be useful to investigate the cause of those issues in order to determine what action by Congress, if any, could effectively address those items.

#### Additional Removal Protections

Congress has previously made changes to the rules for removal of inspectors general, as discussed above. The most frequently discussed of these options has been to allow removal of inspectors general only for reasons that fall within a provided definition of *good cause*.

The version of the Inspector General Reform Act of 2008 that initially passed the House (H.R. 928, 110<sup>th</sup> Congress, as engrossed by the House), for instance, provided that inspectors general would serve for fixed seven-year terms and could be removed only for one of nine specified reasons (including malfeasance, gross mismanagement, and similar justifications). The Senate elected not to adopt this language based on the results of a comptroller general's panel that identified concerns regarding for-cause removal for inspectors general (S.Rept. 110-262 at 4-5).

#### Constitutional Limits on Congress's Policy Options

Some policy options that limit the removal of executive branch officials could raise separation of powers concerns. Congress may explore those issues before enacting legislation that could later be challenged in the courts.

---

**Ben Wilhelm**, Analyst in Government Organization and Management

---

## Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS's institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.