

1 ELIZABETH B. WYDRA (BAR No. 218200)
2 BRIANNE J. GOROD
3 DAVID H. GANS
4 CONSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY CENTER
5 1200 18th Street, NW, Suite 501
6 Washington, D.C. 20036
7 Tel.: (202) 296-6889
8 elizabeth@theusconstitution.org

9 *Counsel for Amici Curiae Members of Congress*

10 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
11 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
12 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

13 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,
14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

16 JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, Attorney
17 General of the United States, *et al.*,

18 Defendants.

19 STATE OF CALIFORNIA *ex rel.* XAVIER
20 BECERRA, Attorney General of the State of
21 California,

22 Plaintiff,

23 v.

24 JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, Attorney
25 General of the United States, *et al.*,

26 Defendants.

Case Nos. 3:17-cv-04642-WHO,
3:17-cv-04701-WHO

BRIEF OF *AMICI CURIAE*
MEMBERS OF CONGRESS
IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS

Date: September 5, 2018

Time: 2:00 p.m.

Judge: Honorable William H. Orrick

Dept: 2

Trial Date: January 28, 2019

1 **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

2 **Page**

3 TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ii

4 INTEREST OF *AMICI CURIAE* 1

5 INTRODUCTION 1

6 ARGUMENT 3

7 I. Congress Did Not Grant the Attorney General the Power To Impose New

8 Grant Conditions on Byrne JAG Program Grantees..... 3

9 II. Separation-of-Powers Principles Do Not Permit the Executive Branch To

10 Impose New Conditions on Recipients of Federal Financial Assistance 9

11 CONCLUSION..... 12

12 APPENDIX..... 1A

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

CASES

City of Chi. v. Sessions,
888 F.3d 272 (7th Cir. 2018)..... 3, 5, 6, 11

City of L.A. v. McLaughlin,
865 F.2d 1084 (9th Cir. 1989)..... 1

City of Phila. v. Sessions,
280 F.Supp.3d 579 (E.D. Pa. 2017)..... 7

Clinton v. City of N.Y.,
524 U.S. 417 (1998) 3, 10, 12

Gonzales v. Oregon,
546 U.S. 243 (2006) 6, 7

INS v. Chadha,
462 U.S. 919 (1983) 12

Kendall v. United States ex rel. Stokes,
37 U.S. (12 Pet.) 524 (1838) 12

Medellín v. Texas,
552 U.S. 491 (2008) 10

Nat’l Fed’n of Indep. Bus. v. Sebelius,
567 U.S. 519 (2012) 3, 11

Pennhurst State Sch. & Hosp. v. Halderman,
451 U.S. 1 (1981) 11

United States v. Butler,
297 U.S. 1 (1936) 11

United States v. Midwest Oil Co.,
236 U.S. 459 (1915) 12

United States v. Williams,
553 U.S. 285 (2008) 7

Util. Air Regulatory Grp. v. EPA,
134 S. Ct. 2427 (2014) 12

Whitman v. Am. Trucking Ass’ns, Inc.,
531 U.S. 457 (2001) 5

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – cont’d

		Page(s)
1		
2		
3	<i>Yates v. United States</i> , 135 S. Ct. 1074 (2015)	7
4		
5	<i>Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer</i> , 343 U.S. 579 (1952)	10
6		
7	<u>CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND LEGISLATIVE MATERIALS</u>	
8	7 C.F.R. § 550.10 (Department of Agriculture).....	8
9	28 C.F.R. § 66.12(a)(5).....	7
10	34 C.F.R. § 80.12 (Department of Education).....	8
11	34 U.S.C. § 10102(a)(1).....	6
12	34 U.S.C. § 10102(a)(2).....	6
13	34 U.S.C. § 10102(a)(3).....	6
14	34 U.S.C. § 10102(a)(4).....	6
15	34 U.S.C. § 10102(a)(5).....	6
16	34 U.S.C. § 10102(a)(6).....	5, 7
17	34 U.S.C. § 10152(a)(1).....	1
18	34 U.S.C. § 10152(c)(1).....	4
19	34 U.S.C. § 10152(d)(2)	5
20	34 U.S.C. § 10153(a)	4
21	34 U.S.C. § 10153(a)(4).....	4
22	34 U.S.C. § 10153(a)(5).....	4
23	45 C.F.R. § 74.14 (Department of Health and Human Services)	8
24		
25	Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006, Pub. L. No. 109-248, § 125, 120 Stat. 587.....	4
26		
27	An Act Declaring the Rights and Liberties of the Subject and Settling the Succession of the Crown (Bill of Rights), 1689, 1 W. & M., c.2, § 4 (Eng.)	9
28		

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – cont’d

	Page(s)
Death in Custody Reporting Act of 2013, Pub. L. No. 113-242, § 2, 128 Stat. 2860 ..	4
H.R. Rep. No. 109-233 (2005).....	4
NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007, Pub. L. No. 110-180, § 104, 121 Stat. 2559 ..	4
OMB Circular No. A-102 (Revised), Grants and Cooperative Agreements with State and Local Governments, § 1(g) (Aug. 29, 1997) ..	7
U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 1.....	3, 10
<u>BOOKS, ARTICLES, AND OTHER AUTHORITIES</u>	
Akhil Reed Amar, <i>America’s Constitution: A Biography</i> (2005).....	10
<i>The Federalist No. 30</i> (Hamilton) (Clinton Rossiter ed., rev. ed. 1999) ..	3, 10, 11
<i>The Federalist No. 31</i> (Hamilton) (Clinton Rossiter ed., rev. ed. 1999) ..	10
<i>The Federalist No. 47</i> (Hamilton) (Clinton Rossiter ed., rev. ed. 1999) ..	9, 10
<i>The Federalist No. 78</i> (Hamilton) (Clinton Rossiter ed., rev. ed. 1999) ..	11
Paul F. Figley & Jay Tidmarsh, <i>The Appropriations Power and Sovereign Immunity</i> , 107 Mich. L. Rev. 1207 (2009) ..	9
1 The Records of the Federal Convention of 1787 (Max Farrand ed., 1911).....	9
Robert J. Reinstein, <i>The Limits of Executive Power</i> , 59 Am. U. L. Rev. 259 (2009) ..	9
U.S. Dep’t of Justice, Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program FY 2018 Local Solicitation (2018), https://www.bja.gov/funding/JAGLocal18.pdf	8

1 **INTEREST OF *AMICI CURIAE***¹

2 *Amici* are members of Congress who are familiar with the laws governing the Edward
3 Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program, a grant program that provides federal
4 financial assistance to states and localities to help them enhance public safety. As *amici* know,
5 Congress established this program to provide states and localities with funding to determine what
6 approaches to law enforcement and public safety will work best in their communities. The grant
7 conditions at issue here undermine Congress’s carefully considered plan in establishing this
8 program, as well as fundamental constitutional principles that give Congress, not the executive
9 branch, the power to make laws establishing conditions on the receipt of federal financial
10 assistance. *Amici* have a strong interest in ensuring that the executive branch respects the role of
11 Congress in our Constitution’s system of separation of powers and the laws that it has enacted.

14 A full listing of *amici* appears in the Appendix.

15 **INTRODUCTION**

16 The Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (“Byrne JAG”) Program provides
17 federal financial assistance to localities across the country, including the plaintiffs in these cases,
18 to help them enhance public safety as they see fit. Using a formula keyed to the jurisdiction’s
19 population and violent crime rate, Byrne JAG grants provide states and cities with financial
20 assistance that they can use to “provide additional personnel, equipment, supplies, contractual
21 support, training, technical assistance, and information systems for criminal justice.” 34 U.S.C.
22 § 10152(a)(1); *City of L.A. v. McLaughlin*, 865 F.2d 1084, 1088 (9th Cir. 1989) (“‘formula’
23 grants,” unlike discretionary grants, “are not awarded at the discretion of a state or federal
24 agency, but are awarded pursuant to a statutory formula”). Reflecting the primary role of states
25
26
27

28 ¹ No person or entity other than *amici* and their counsel assisted in or made a monetary contribution to the preparation or submission of this brief.

1 and cities in fighting crime, the statute establishing the Byrne JAG program places minimal
2 limits on the public safety and criminal justice uses to which funds may be allocated.

3 Despite all of this, in July 2017, Attorney General Jeff Sessions sought to
4 administratively mandate new funding conditions for every Byrne JAG grant, seeking to coerce
5 local jurisdictions into adopting immigration policies preferred by President Trump.
6 Significantly, Congress neither imposed these conditions, nor authorized the Attorney General to
7 impose them. As *amici* know from their experience in Congress, Congress designed the Byrne
8 JAG program as a formula grant to ensure that states and localities would have maximum
9 flexibility in determining how to best improve public safety in their jurisdictions. The one-size-
10 fits-all conditions that the Attorney General now seeks to impose are not only at odds with the
11 flexibility that was central to Congress’s plan in establishing the grant program, but also would
12 undermine public safety in jurisdictions like California and the city and county of San Francisco,
13 by decreasing trust and cooperation between the police force and crime victims and witnesses in
14 many neighborhoods.
15
16
17

18 To ensure that states and localities would have maximum discretion in determining how
19 to use the funds, Congress limited the executive branch’s authority over the program, giving the
20 Attorney General only extremely narrow powers over its administration. None of these powers
21 authorizes the Attorney General to add new substantive conditions on the award of grants, which
22 is why the Attorney General here relies, in part, on a statute that does not concern either the
23 Byrne JAG program or the Attorney General. And that statute, which imposes duties on the
24 Assistant Attorney General of Justice Programs that are primarily related to information sharing,
25 does not help the Attorney General either. Congress did not hide an elephant in that mousehole.
26
27

28 The Attorney General’s attempt to administratively write into law new substantive Byrne

1 JAG grant conditions not authorized by Congress—and, indeed, at odds with the laws Congress
2 did pass—also runs afoul of fundamental constitutional principles. The Framers of our
3 Constitution took pains to deny the executive branch the power to both make the law and then
4 execute it, recognizing that such concentrated power “in the hands of a single branch is a threat
5 to liberty.” *Clinton v. City of N.Y.*, 524 U.S. 417, 450 (1998) (Kennedy, J., concurring); *see City*
6 *of Chi. v. Sessions*, 888 F.3d 272, 277 (7th Cir. 2018) (“The founders of our country well
7 understood that the concentration of power threatens individual liberty and established a bulwark
8 against such tyranny by creating a separation of powers among the branches of government.”).
9 They also conferred on Congress in the Spending Clause the “Power To lay and collect Taxes,
10 Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general
11 Welfare of the United States.” U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 1. Under this Clause, Congress may
12 “grant federal funds to the States” and impose conditions to “ensure that the funds are used by
13 the States to ‘provide for the . . . general Welfare’ in the manner Congress intended.” *Nat’l*
14 *Fed’n of Indep. Bus. v. Sebelius*, 567 U.S. 519, 576 (2012) (“NFIB”); *see Chicago*, 888 F.3d at
15 277 (“the power of the purse rests with Congress”). The Framers thus gave the legislative
16 power, including the authority to impose conditions on the receipt of federal financial assistance,
17 to Congress, recognizing that “[m]oney is . . . considered as the vital principle of the body
18 politic; as that which sustains its life and motion and enables it to perform its most essential
19 functions.” *The Federalist No. 30*, at 156 (Hamilton) (Clinton Rossiter ed., rev. ed. 1999). The
20 Attorney General’s actions cannot be squared with our Framers’ design.

25 ARGUMENT

26 **I. Congress Did Not Grant the Attorney General the Power To Impose New Grant** 27 **Conditions on Byrne JAG Program Grantees.**

28 In enacting the Byrne JAG program, Congress sought to give state and local law

1 enforcement “flexibility to spend [federal] money for programs that work for them rather than to
2 impose a ‘one size fits all’ solution.” H.R. Rep. No. 109-233, at 89 (2005). To achieve that end,
3 Congress gave states and local jurisdictions considerable discretion in determining how best to
4 spend the funds that they were awarded under the grant program. Congress of course retains its
5 power to impose conditions on the receipt of grant funds when it concludes that some policy is
6 sufficiently important to do so. *See, e.g.*, NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007, Pub. L.
7 No. 110-180, § 104, 121 Stat. 2559, 2569 (codified at 34 U.S.C. § 40914(b)(2)) (providing for the
8 withholding of up to 5 percent of Byrne JAG formula grant funds to states that fail to provide
9 adequate records to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System); *see also* Adam
10 Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006, Pub. L. No. 109-248, § 125, 120 Stat. 587, 598
11 (codified at 34 U.S.C. § 20927); Death in Custody Reporting Act of 2013, Pub. L. No. 113-242,
12 § 2, 128 Stat. 2860, 2861 (codified at 34 U.S.C. § 60105(c)(2)). But Congress did not give the
13 power to make that determination to the executive branch. In fact, it did just the opposite, carefully
14 limiting the Attorney General’s role in administering the program. It granted him a handful of
15 specifically defined and exceedingly narrow powers, thereby ensuring that the executive branch
16 would not impose constraints on award recipients that were at odds with Congress’s decisions
17 about how best to structure the program.

18
19
20
21 In designing the Byrne JAG program, Congress simply conferred on the Attorney
22 General the authority to choose the “form” of the application for funds, 34 U.S.C. § 10153(a),
23 and the “certification” that grantees must sign, *id.* § 10153(a)(5), to impose reasonable reporting
24 requirements, *id.* § 10153(a)(4), and to set “guidelines” to be used to conduct “program
25 assessment[s],” *id.* § 10152(c)(1). Congress also gave the Attorney General the authority to
26 permit, based on a finding of “extraordinary and exigent circumstances,” jurisdictions to spend
27
28

1 their Byrne JAG funds on certain “vehicles,” “vessels,” “aircraft,” “luxury items” “real estate,”
2 “construction projects,” or “similar matters.” *Id.* § 10152(d)(2). Nothing in the Byrne JAG
3 statute authorizes the Attorney General to impose additional conditions on grantees, as he has
4 attempted to do here. *See Chicago*, 888 F.3d at 284 (no provision in Byrne JAG statute grants
5 the Attorney General the authority to impose these conditions).
6

7 The Attorney General effectively concedes as much, relying not on the provision governing
8 the Byrne JAG program, but instead on a separate provision, 34 U.S.C. § 10102(a)(6), that does
9 not even address the powers of the Attorney General, but instead sets forth the powers of the
10 Assistant Attorney General for Justice Programs. D.E. 114, *San Francisco v. Sessions*, at 10-12;
11 D.E. 124, *California v. Sessions*, at 12-15. But that statute, which gives the Assistant Attorney
12 General the authority to “exercise such other powers and functions as may be vested in the
13 Assistant Attorney General pursuant to this chapter or by delegation of the Attorney General,
14 including placing special conditions on all grants, and determining priority purposes for formula
15 grants,” does not supersede Congress’s decision to deny the Attorney General the authority to
16 impose substantive constraints on Byrne JAG grantees. 34 U.S.C. § 10102(a)(6) (emphasis
17 added).
18

19 First, Section 10102 is located in an entirely different subchapter of the U.S. Code than the
20 Byrne JAG program, and nothing in the text suggests that it governs the Byrne JAG program.
21 “Congress . . . does not alter the fundamental details of a regulatory scheme in vague terms or
22 ancillary provisions—it does not, one might say, hide elephants in mouseholes.” *Whitman v. Am.*
23 *Trucking Ass’ns, Inc.*, 531 U.S. 457, 468 (2001). But here, the Attorney General claims that,
24 despite the lengths to which Congress went to sharply circumscribe the Attorney General’s
25 authority under the Byrne JAG program, a provision in a different subchapter of the Code
26
27
28

1 implicitly gives a subordinate of the Attorney General, the Assistant Attorney General of Justice
2 Programs, the sweeping power to add new substantive conditions to grants. Indeed, the Assistant
3 Attorney General “is an unlikely recipient of such broad authority,” given “the statute’s otherwise
4 careful allocation of decisionmaking powers.” *Gonzales v. Oregon*, 546 U.S. 243, 274 (2006).

5
6 Second, the text of Section 10102 makes clear that it does not vest in the Assistant
7 Attorney General lawmaking powers to impose new substantive conditions on grants. *See*
8 *Chicago*, 888 F.3d at 284 (“The Attorney General’s interpretation is contrary to the plain
9 meaning of the statutory language.”). Section 10102 merely requires the Assistant Attorney
10 General to deliver information about the state of the criminal justice system, *see* 34 U.S.C.
11 § 10102(a)(1) (duty to “publish and disseminate information on . . . criminal justice systems”);
12 *id.* §10102(a)(3) (duty to “provide information . . . relating to criminal justice”), and to maintain
13 relationships with stakeholders, government bodies, and experts in the field, *see id.* §10102(a)(2)
14 (duty to “maintain liaison with the executive and judicial branches of the Federal and State
15 governments in matters relating to criminal justice”); *id.* §10102(a)(4) (duty to “maintain liaison
16 with public and private educational and research institutions, State and local governments, and
17 governments of other nations relating to criminal justice”); *id.* §10102(a)(5) (duty to “coordinate
18 and provide staff support to coordinate the activities of” various government offices). None of
19 these obligations, which focus primarily on delivering information and maintaining contacts,
20 authorizes the Assistant Attorney General to add new substantive grant conditions.

21
22
23
24 After imposing that list of specific obligations on the Assistant Attorney General, Section
25 10102 contains a catch-all provision stating that the Assistant Attorney General may “exercise
26 such other powers and functions as may be vested in the Assistant Attorney General pursuant to
27 this chapter or by delegation of the Attorney General, including placing special conditions on all
28

1 grants, and determining priority purposes for formula grants.” *Id.* § 10102(a)(6). The Attorney
2 General’s reliance on this provision is misplaced. To start, Section 10102(a)(6) does not
3 specifically confer any new authority on the Assistant Attorney General: it simply makes clear
4 that the Assistant Attorney General may exercise such power “as may be vested” “pursuant to
5 this chapter or by delegation of the Attorney General,” including “placing special conditions on
6 all grants.” *Id.* Nowhere in the U.S. Code has the Assistant Attorney General been vested with
7 the power to make new law and add substantive grant conditions.
8

9 On top of that, the Attorney General’s argument depends on reading the “special
10 conditions” language in this subprovision in isolation from the rest of Section 10102. But
11 “statutes ‘should not be read as a series of unrelated and isolated provisions.’” *Gonzales*, 546
12 U.S. at 273 (quoting *Gustafson v. Alloyd Co.*, 513 U.S. 561, 570 (1995)). Rather, courts “avoid
13 ascribing to one word a meaning so broad that it is inconsistent with its accompanying words,
14 thus giving unintended breadth to the Acts of Congress.” *Yates v. United States*, 135 S. Ct. 1074,
15 1085 (2015) (internal quotations omitted); *United States v. Williams*, 553 U.S. 285, 294 (2008)
16 (“[A] word is given more precise content by the neighboring words with which it is
17 associated.”). The sweeping lawmaking power the Attorney General claims differs in kind from
18 the narrow information-sharing obligations imposed by Section 10102.
19
20

21 Finally, the authority to place “special conditions” on grants is not a lawmaking power to
22 add new conditions; rather, it “is a term of art for conditions intended for ‘high-risk grantees’
23 with difficulty adhering to existing grant requirements.” *City of Phila. v. Sessions*, 280 F. Supp.
24 3d 579, 617 (E.D. Pa. 2017); *see* 28 C.F.R. § 66.12(a)(5) (DOJ regulations noting that, for high
25 risk grantees, “special conditions and/or restrictions shall correspond to the high risk condition
26 and shall be included in the award”); OMB Circular No. A-102 (Revised), Grants and
27
28

1 Cooperative Agreements with State and Local Governments, § 1(g) (Aug. 29, 1997) (“Agencies
2 may impose special conditions or restrictions on awards to ‘high risk’ applicants/grantees”). The
3 regulations applicable to other federal agencies are similar. *See* 7 C.F.R. § 550.10 (Department
4 of Agriculture); 34 C.F.R. § 80.12 (Department of Education); 45 C.F.R. § 74.14 (Department of
5 Health and Human Services). The government’s argument cannot be squared with this settled,
6 circumscribed meaning.
7

8 In sum, the Attorney General has sought to arrogate to himself the power to set
9 conditions on federal funding in order to make all Byrne JAG recipients follow President
10 Trump’s preferred immigration policies. In doing so, he threatens not only to undermine the
11 statute’s carefully-crafted flexibility and frustrate its goal of enhancing public safety, but also to
12 impose new costs on Byrne JAG recipients, as the Department of Justice acknowledged in its
13 solicitation form. *See* U.S. Dep’t of Justice, Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant
14 Program FY 2018 Local Solicitation 37 (2018), <https://www.bja.gov/funding/JAGLocal18.pdf>
15 (advising that “[t]he reasonable costs . . . of complying with these conditions, including honoring
16 any duly authorized requests from DHS that is encompassed by these conditions, will be
17 allowable costs under the award”). The imposition of these new costs only underscores how
18 fundamentally the Attorney General’s actions are at odds with Congress’s plan in establishing
19 the program. As noted earlier, Congress wanted to give states and localities financial support
20 and maximum flexibility in determining how best to enhance public safety in their jurisdictions.
21 But these new costs would require states and localities to prioritize the executive branch’s policy
22 preferences over their own. Congress carefully limited the Attorney General’s powers over the
23 grant program to prevent exactly that. The Attorney General’s actions thus violate the statute,
24 and they also violate fundamental constitutional principles, as the next Section discusses.
25
26
27
28

1 **II. Separation-of-Powers Principles Do Not Permit the Executive Branch To Impose**
2 **New Conditions on Recipients of Federal Financial Assistance.**

3 When the Framers wrote the Constitution more than two centuries ago, they took pains to
4 deny the President the kind of sweeping powers the King of England had enjoyed. In the
5 seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, British Kings had used their royal prerogatives both to
6 legislate, and to tax and spend, without the approval of Parliament. *See, e.g.*, Robert J. Reinstein,
7 *The Limits of Executive Power*, 59 Am. U. L. Rev. 259, 272-77 (2009); Paul F. Figley & Jay
8 Tidmarsh, *The Appropriations Power and Sovereign Immunity*, 107 Mich. L. Rev. 1207, 1217-29
9 (2009). After centuries of struggle, Parliament succeeded in ending these prerogatives. The Bill
10 of Rights of 1689 prohibited the various devices the King had used to raise money on his own,
11 providing that “levying money for or to the use of the Crown by pretence of prerogative, without
12 grant of Parliament, for longer time, or in other manner than the same is or shall be granted, is
13 illegal.” An Act Declaring the Rights and Liberties of the Subject and Settling the Succession of
14 the Crown (Bill of Rights), 1689, 1 W. & M., c.2, § 4 (Eng.). In 1782, Parliament eliminated the
15 King’s prerogative to determine how the “civil list”—the domestic budget—would be spent.
16 Figley & Tidmarsh, *supra*, at 1229.
17

18 In the U.S. Constitution, “the prerogatives that had been discredited in England were
19 naturally rejected by the Framers.” Reinstein, *supra*, at 307. The Framers gave the lawmaking
20 power, including the power of the purse, to Congress, recognizing that “the Prerogatives of the
21 British Monarch” were not “a proper guide in defining the Executive powers.” 1 The Records of
22 the Federal Convention of 1787, at 65 (Max Farrand ed., 1911). The U.S. Constitution strictly
23 limited the President’s lawmaking powers, appreciating that “[w]hen the legislative and
24 executive powers are united in the same person or body . . . there can be no liberty.” *The*
25 *Federalist No. 47*, *supra*, at 271 (Madison) (quoting Montesquieu).
26
27
28

1 As the Supreme Court has explained, “the President’s power to see that the laws are
2 faithfully executed refutes the idea that he is to be a lawmaker.” *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.*
3 *v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579, 587 (1952); *id.* at 655 (Jackson, J., concurring) (“The Executive, except
4 for recommendation and veto, has no legislative power.”). Thus, “[t]he President’s authority to
5 act, as with the exercise of any governmental power, ‘must stem either from an act of Congress
6 or from the Constitution itself.’” *Medellin v. Texas*, 552 U.S. 491, 524 (2008) (quoting
7 *Youngstown*, 343 U.S. at 585). These separation-of-powers principles “[were] designed to
8 implement a fundamental insight: Concentration of power in the hands of a single branch is a
9 threat to liberty.” *Clinton*, 524 U.S. at 450 (Kennedy, J., concurring); *The Federalist No. 47*,
10 *supra*, at 269 (Madison) (“The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary,
11 in the same hands . . . may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny.”).

14 In the Spending Clause, the Framers explicitly gave the power to tax and spend—which
15 British Kings had claimed as a royal prerogative—to Congress, denying the President the power
16 of the purse. The Spending Clause is the first and one of the most sweeping powers the
17 Constitution confers upon Congress, providing the power “[t]o lay and collect Taxes, Duties,
18 Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare
19 of the United States.” U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 1. The Framers, who had witnessed the
20 disastrous consequences of the failure of the Articles of Confederation to give such a power to
21 Congress, called the power of the purse “an indispensable ingredient in every constitution,” *The*
22 *Federalist No. 30, supra*, at 156 (Hamilton); *The Federalist No. 31, supra*, at 163 (Hamilton)
23 (“[R]evenue is the essential engine by which the means of answering the national exigencies
24 must be procured.”); Akhil Reed Amar, *America’s Constitution: A Biography* 106 (2005)
25 (explaining that under the Articles, Congress could raise money only by making requests to the
26
27
28

1 States, but “State governments had often failed to provide the funds that the Confederation
2 demanded of them,” and that “[w]ithout a strong revenue stream, vital federal functions were
3 withering”). The Framers thus gave Congress power over “all those matters which will call for
4 disbursements out of the national treasury.” *The Federalist No. 30, supra*, at 156 (Hamilton);
5 *The Federalist No. 78, supra*, at 433 (Hamilton) (“The legislature not only commands the purse
6 but prescribes the rules by which the duties and rights of every citizen are to be regulated.”).

7
8 Because the Framers gave the Spending Clause power to Congress alone, and because they
9 strictly limited the President’s lawmaking powers, the executive branch has no power to dictate
10 what the federal government spends money on, or the conditions it attaches to those
11 expenditures. Rather, it is Congress—and Congress alone—that has broad power to “fix the
12 terms on which it shall disburse federal money to the States.” *Pennhurst State Sch. & Hosp. v.*
13 *Halderman*, 451 U.S. 1, 17 (1981); *see NFIB*, 567 U.S. at 576 (“Congress may use this power to
14 grant federal funds to the States, and may condition such a grant upon the States’ ‘taking certain
15 actions that Congress could not require them to take.’” (quoting *Coll. Sav. Bank v. Fla. Prepaid*
16 *Postsecondary Educ. Expense Bd.*, 527 U.S. 666, 686 (1999))); *United States v. Butler*, 297 U.S.
17 1, 66 (1936) (“power of Congress to authorize expenditure of public moneys for public purposes
18 is not limited by the direct grants of legislative power found in the Constitution”); *Chicago*, 888
19 F.3d at 283 (“the Executive Branch does not have the inherent authority . . . to condition the
20 payment of such federal [grant] funds on adherence to its political priorities”).

21
22 Because the power to “fix the terms on which [Congress] shall disburse federal money to the
23 States,” *Pennhurst*, 451 U.S. at 17, belongs to Congress alone, the Executive cannot change
24 Congress’s decision, except by persuading Congress to amend the laws that it has enacted. It is
25 well settled that “[t]he Constitution does not confer upon [the President] any power to enact laws
26
27
28

1 or to suspend or repeal such as the Congress enacts.” *United States v. Midwest Oil Co.*, 236 U.S.
2 459, 505 (1915); *Kendall v. United States ex rel. Stokes*, 37 U.S. (12 Pet.) 524, 613 (1838)
3 (refusing to “cloth[e] the President with a power entirely to control the legislation of congress”);
4 *see Clinton*, 524 U.S. at 447 (the President lacks “unilateral power to change the text of duly
5 enacted statutes”). In other words, the executive branch cannot make an end-run around the
6 “single, finely wrought,” “step-by step, deliberate and deliberative process,” *INS v. Chadha*, 462
7 U.S. 919, 951, 959 (1983), the Framers prescribed for lawmaking. To license such executive
8 lawmaking “would deal a severe blow to the Constitution’s separation of powers.” *Util. Air*
9 *Regulatory Grp. v. EPA*, 134 S. Ct. 2427, 2446 (2014).

12 In sum, while the President’s duty of “executing the laws necessarily includes both authority
13 and responsibility to resolve some questions left open by Congress . . . it does not include a
14 power to revise . . . clear statutory terms to suit [his] own sense of how [a] statute should
15 operate.” *Id.* Yet that is exactly what the Attorney General has attempted to do here.

17 CONCLUSION

18 For the foregoing reasons, the plaintiffs’ motions for summary judgment should be granted.

19 Dated: August 22, 2018

20 Respectfully submitted,

21 /s/ Elizabeth B. Wydra

22 Elizabeth B. Wydra

23 Elizabeth B. Wydra

24 Brianne J. Gorod

25 David H. Gans

26 CONSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY CENTER

27 1200 18th Street, N.W., Suite 501

28 Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 296-6889

elizabeth@theusconstitution.org

Counsel for Amici Curiae Members of Congress

1 **APPENDIX – LIST OF *AMICI***

2 **U.S. Senate**

3 Harris, Kamala D.
4 Senator of California

5 Blumenthal, Richard
6 Senator of Connecticut

7 Booker, Cory
8 Senator of New Jersey

9 Durbin, Richard J.
10 Senator of Illinois

11 Hirono, Mazie K.
12 Senator of Hawai‘i

13 Leahy, Patrick J.
14 Senator of Vermont

15 Menendez, Robert
16 Senator of New Jersey

17 Whitehouse, Sheldon
18 Senator of Rhode Island

19 Wyden, Ron
20 Senator of Oregon

21 **U.S. House of Representatives**

22 Lofgren, Zoe
23 Representative of California

24 Pelosi, Nancy
25 Representative of California

26 Aguilar, Pete
27 Representative of California

28 Barragán, Nanette Diaz
Representative of California

LIST OF *AMICI* – cont’d

1
2 Bass, Karen
3 Representative of California

4 Chu, Judy
5 Representative of California

6 DeSaulnier, Mark
7 Representative of California

8 Eshoo, Anna G.
9 Representative of California

10 Gomez, Jimmy
11 Representative of California

12 Huffman, Jared
13 Representative of California

14 Jayapal, Pramila
15 Representative of Washington

16 Lee, Barbara
17 Representative of California

18 Lieu, Ted W.
19 Representative of California

20 Lowenthal, Alan
21 Representative of California

22 Matsui, Doris O.
23 Representative of California

24 McNerney, Jerry
25 Representative of California

26 Napolitano, Grace F.
27 Representative of California

28 Roybal-Allard, Lucille
Representative of California

Swalwell, Eric
Representative of California

LIST OF *AMICI* – cont’d

Thompson, Mike
Representative of California

Torres, Norma
Representative of California

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2

3 I hereby certify that on August 22, 2018, the foregoing document was filed with the Clerk

4 of the Court, using the CM/ECF system, causing it to be served on all counsel of record.

5 Dated: August 22, 2018

6 /s/ Elizabeth B. Wydra
7 Elizabeth B. Wydra

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28