## 1 COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SENATE ADDRESS 2 3 In re: Examining Attorney General Kathleen Kane's ability to perform the duties of her office with a suspended law license. 4 5 6 VOLUME I - Pages 1-49 7 8 Stenographic report of hearing held in Hearing Room 1, North Office Building, 9 Capitol Complex, Harrisburg, PA 10 Monday November 9, 2015 11 1:00 p.m. 12 13 SEN. JOHN GORDNER, CHAIRMAN 14 MEMBERS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SENATE ADDRESS 15 Sen. Lisa Baker Sen. Sean Wiley 16 Sen. Art Haywood Sen. Gene Yaw Sen. Judy Schwank Sen. Joe Scarnati, ex officio 17 18 19 Also Present: 20 Joshua Funk, Esquire, Majority Counsel 21 Shannon Sargent, Esquire, Minority Counsel 22 23 Reported by: 24 Ann-Marie P. Sweeney Chief Official Reporter 25

## INDEX TO WITNESSES WITNESS: PAGE Hon. David R. Heckler, District Attorney, Bucks County Hon. John T. Adams, District Attorney, Berks County Hon. Lisa Lazzari-Strasiser, District Attorney, Somerset County

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Good afternoon. I'd like to call the public hearing of the Special Committee on Senate Address to order. We have six of the seven Members of the committee here before you. I am the Chair, John Gordner. To my far left we have Senator Judy -- I'm sorry, he was leaning back there. To my far left we have Senator Art Haywood, we have Senator Judy Schwank. Next to me we have Senator Sean Wiley. To my right we have Senator Gene Yaw. And to the far right we have Senator Lisa Baker.

We have a panel of district attorneys here with us today. We have, on my left, the Honorable John T. Adams from Berks County. In the middle we have the Honorable David Heckler from Bucks County. And on the right we have the Honorable Lisa Lazzari-Strasiser of Somerset County. All elected district attorneys from 3 of our 67 counties. So we want to thank you for being a part of the panel.

I'm going to ask you if you would stand to be sworn in, please.

(Whereupon, Hon. JOHN T. ADAMS, Hon. DAVID W. HECKLER, and Hon. LISA LAZZARI-STRASISER, were duly sworn.)

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: This is the first hearing that this committee is having as a public hearing in regard to the charge that we got from the President pro tem, and we have asked this panel of district attorneys to come before us today. Obviously, you, on a weekly basis, have relations with

1 the Attorney General's Office in regard to prosecution, in 2 regard to conflict referrals, and we'd like to hear from you 3 in regard to the relationship of that as it currently exists. So whichever one of you wants to start. 4 5 Maybe I could just ask, we did ask for a 6 bipartisan group. If I'm correct, Mr. Adams, you're a 7 Democratic district attorney? 8 MR. ADAMS: That is correct. 9 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Mr. Heckler, you are a 10 Republican district attorney? 11 MR. HECKLER: I am. 12 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: And Ms. Lazzari-Strasiser, you 13 are a Democratic district attorney? 14 MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: That's correct. 15 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: So I'll turn it over to whoever wants to take the lead, just to give us some testimony. 16 17 know you have some written testimony that you submitted. 18 can stand by that or you can just give some oral testimony. 19 We do have a stenographer taking the information. 20 So I'll turn it over to the panel. If you could 21 make sure that your microphone is on. You need to push the Mr. Heckler, you should reasonably know. 22 button. 23 MR. HECKLER: There we go. I do see a green 24 light. 25 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Excellent.

MR. HECKLER: I assume -- I don't think I had the privilege of serving with any of you gentlemen, but if you know me, maybe there may be a time to hit the red light. But hopefully that hasn't come yet.

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

At any event, to take up perhaps the first matter you mentioned, Mr. Chairman, which is addressed in our prepared testimony, the issue has been raised that there has been some difficulty with regard to referral of conflict cases to the Attorney General. Frankly, I have not experienced that situation, and I've been in office both before the existing administration and obviously since. I think there has been some comment made, some of our colleagues have offered some thoughts on that or had some negative experience. speak for my colleagues here. I think as we note in our prepared testimony, frankly, our perception is that -- or at least I'll speak for myself, my perception is that that is more a function of philosophy, perhaps a slightly different philosophy on the part of those who are administrators below the Attorney General, and certainly decisions made in good faith and not -- with considerable basis in law and thought.

I would be happy, depending on how fulsome a record you wish to build, to discourse on this at greater length. I have sort of a unique perspective because a long time ago I was counsel to the District Attorneys Association in the years immediately before the enactment of the

Commonwealth Attorneys Act when the present referral regime, of course, went into statute and came about. And one of my jobs was to help district attorneys deal with those matters before there was a statutory structure, and folks really sort of worked out their own arrangements. But I have to tell you that if my wife were here she would tell you that if you asked me what time it is, there's a decent chance you will get a bit of the history of timekeeping over the centuries, perhaps the movement of the planets, and I'm not sure that that's pertinent to your very serious issues that you have before you.

So I will volunteer myself, if you wish to ask questions later on. If you even, I'd be happy to speak with your counsel separately to just provide sort of historical background, but I'm going to unusually restrain myself as to that, at least from certainly from the Bucks County perspective, that has not been -- there hasn't been a change and they've taken the referrals that—we try and be sparing—they take the referrals that we've sent them under both administrations.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Okay. I'll defer to Berks

County or Somerset County, if they have any information they would like to give from your perspective.

MR. ADAMS: Well, with respect to the referral issue, we have not had any issues. The cases that I have

referred to -- let me put my mike on there. The cases that our office has referred to the Office of Attorney General have been accepted. I don't think they've ever declined. When I initially came into office, which was under a prior administration, frankly, I had to forward about 75 cases because I was, in my prior life, I was defense counsel.

You know, we're aware, though, that there's been some issues in some other counties as to actual referrals, but again, from the perspective of Berks County, our referrals have always been--that we've requested--have been approved.

MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: With regard to Somerset
County, I'm just finishing up my first term. I have only had
a reason or a case that had a conflict on one occasion, and it
was accepted, but it was a glaring conflict. I was the
defense attorney through the public defender's office in the
adjacent county for this new case, so clearly as a prosecutor
I would have had information that a prosecutor should not have
had.

I do have to say that in the sense that there were cases that I ultimately did not ask for a referral on, where I wanted to consult, I was unable to reach the Attorney General's Office in those matters. And in the end I just decided that unless the defense raised the issue, that I would accept the prosecution and continue through the case whether, you know, the conflict was never raised.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Was that a recent incident, or did that happen previously?

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

MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: It was within the last 12 months, on two occasions.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Okay. Let me ask, and we're going to leave Members, and then there's some other testimony that you may want to give as well. We'll have Members asking questions and then go back. Just in my paper in the last week, there was a jury that was being selected in Union County and being prosecuted by the Attorney General's Office, and Christopher Jones is the Senior Deputy Attorney General who is prosecuting this case involving child pornography. And during the jury pool process, the Deputy Attorney General asked the potential jurors if they were aware of Kathleen Kane's legal woes, and elicited responses from the pool of 30 jurors as to whether they were aware of her issues or not, and then to determine whether that would allow them to be stricken as jurors. It was noted in the newspaper that this was now common practice by any of the Deputy Attorneys General that were prosecuting cases in any counties since her law license has been suspended.

Has any one of you been aware of or ran into that situation that has arisen in the last week or two in the jury process, or is it too fresh?

MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: Not in Somerset County, we

1 have not. 2 MR. HECKLER: This is the first I've heard of 3 that. 4 MR. ADAMS: Same here. I've not heard of that. 5 They have not had any trials in my county in the past 60 to 90 6 days, so I have not heard of it. 7 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Okay. And again, it may be 8 just fresh as a result of it. This just happened to be a jury pool selection on Monday, October 26. So it would have been 9 10 just shortly after that, but apparently, according to the 11 newspaper and according to the Attorney General's Office, that is now standard questioning that they're going to be doing in 12 13 the jury selection process around the State. 14 MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: I believe there was reported that, and it was my impression that the defense 15 16 counsel during trial made comment to the jury about what 17 they're calling the K-factor, or something to that extent. 18 And are you also asking about that? 19 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Sure. 20 MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: I mean, that's surely 21 going to be common practice, I would think. 22 MR. ADAMS: Yes. 23 MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: Any defense attorney that

wouldn't raise it would certainly be considered, or could be

considered ineffective because of the prejudice.

24

25

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Can you elaborate on that? So during any trial that you would be involved in, or your office would be involved with, that during the, what, closing argument process, or opening argument, or motions?

MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: I actually thought it was

reported as there was -- it was live testimony. There was either an agent of the Attorney General's Office testifying and the comment was made, or the question on cross-examination was presented by the defense attorney with regard to who his boss was. Was he operating under Kathleen Kane? And it elicited kind of a smirk response within the jury box and the judge called for a recess and counsel were addressed in chambers over it. And that surely jeopardizes the process of objectivity and unbiased decisionmaking in the jury box.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Okay. If there's more information on that specific case, if you are able to go back and even in contact with your State District Attorneys

Association and provide information to myself that I could then distribute to the committee, I would appreciate that.

Let's have a couple of questions from the committee. I'll recognize Senator Wiley, and then Senator Baker.

SENATOR WILEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Lazzari-Strasiser -- first of all, thank all of you for joining us today. We really appreciate your

testimony.

Specific to your concern as far as your lack of response from the Attorney General's Office when you were requesting some consultation.

MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: Yes.

SENATOR WILEY: You said that happened within the last 12 months?

MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: Yes.

SENATOR WILEY: Was that prior to October 21?

MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: Yes.

when the Attorney General's law license was suspended. I'm really focused on the impact that it has on your specific offices. I know that we had requested that information from each of you. Again, we're very focused on identifying the answer to one particular question in this committee, and that is: Can an individual with a suspended law license perform the duties of Attorney General in this Commonwealth? That's a large task that we have in front of us. But I'm really intent to hear some of the specifics, if there are any specifics of the process -- if there's any specifics of the process and duties of your office that have been impacted by this. And it doesn't appear that there are any specifics, is that correct? Any of you?

MR. ADAMS: Well, I think the -- whether or not my

particular office has been impacted by the suspension of her law license I would say is somewhat inconsequential. I'm not going -- I'm going to go out of my way not to refer a case to the Office of Attorney General. That's been my practice for years, unless it's a clear conflict where we can't handle the case, but otherwise, we're going to handle the case. So as to our direct impact in that manner, I don't -- from our perspective in Berks County, I see no impact because while we work together with their agents in some of our drug fighting efforts, her direct loss of license hasn't impacted us in Berks County.

MR. HECKLER: And I would certainly say the same is true of Bucks, and my philosophy is very much the same as John's. I am loathe to refer cases, frankly, in many cases I've perceived that my resources are at least as substantial as those of the Attorney General's for a lot of purposes and I hate to be sticking them with things that we can do. I would not -- I am not surprised to learn that those who are trying cases for the Attorney General would be attempting to screen a jury in advance, just to revert to that question.

We do -- in one of the cases we referred involves a very successful investigation by the Office of Attorney General. The case is now awaiting trial in Bucks County, with, however, with an out-of-county judge, but virtually the entire judiciary and I disqualified ourselves, and the

Attorney General's Office, of course, that's been going on for 9 months or a year, they've done a very nice job with it. I'm sure that that question would be asked simply because the defense -- whether it's meritorious or not, you can certainly see the defense counsel attempting to pooh-pooh the case that's being brought against his or her client with sort of a, "Well, the AG put you up to this and, you know, she's kicking up sand," or whatever. It's some reflection on her troubles when, I think, in fact, a reasonable juror would not conclude that, but that's what voir dire is for, to weed those out.

MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: I have maybe a different perspective because I come from a rural, smaller county, and if you want, I believe that I've had a direct impact. Just this morning on my way here my chief detective called me and asked -- we have a joint task force, a joint drug task force that's currently operating through the Attorney General's Office, and their question is what do we do? Do we suspend that investigation? Do we wait for the outcome, whatever decision is made? And I really had to say that's something we'll have to address when I get back to the office. So there is a direct impact considering the ripple effect of the ability to ultimately prosecute those cases where you are utilizing the Attorney General funds and resources.

I failed to say that we have discussed this and the DA Association and we are very grateful that this

committee has been impaneled. This is far-reaching. None of us took the oath of our offices without the seriousness of operating with integrity and, more important, lawfully. So I just wanted to extend my thanks. This is something that's, like I said, will have a tremendous ripple effect across the State.

SENATOR WILEY: Well, thank you, and it's a testament to the three of you that, from what I understand, we reached out to the District Attorneys Association and you were selected and suggested that you come before this committee.

So, that's a testament to your hard work and dedication, so I thank you for your testimony.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: I'm going to call on Senator
Baker next. I just need to follow up, and I apologize if
she's going to ask the same thing, but just because -- you
just now have indicated that there is great concern, I guess,
among your State association, as well as you individually, in
regard to, for instance, the task force. The task force
process, drug task force process has been very successful for
many years, including during the past 3 years, but it is
normally a joint effort, and it's often a multi-county
effort--

MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: --in regard to this process, and it's normally a long effort. Usually there are months and

months and months and months of investigations and processes and drug buys until you get ready to make the big announcement. And usually it's not 1 or 2 people, often it's 7, 8, 9, 10 people. So the net is wide. So just, again, to follow up, can you again express your concern with the current status? Does it directly relate to the Attorney General having a suspended law license and being uncertain, or what's your concern?

MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: We're certainly not here to answer that question of whether or not she's able to practice on a suspended license. That's the decision that you folks, unfortunately, have to make. But the question that I am being presented as the elected DA for Somerset County is, do we have continued authority and the designation, the oaths that were signed, is it still lawful? Are we still able -- because I only have jurisdiction in Somerset County. That grants me jurisdiction to cross county lines, if that's where the investigation leads. So that's the ultimate question. Do I still have the lawful authority to operate that?

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: And again, never been DA, never worked in a DA's office, I'm an attorney, but are there documents specifically related to the drug task force--

MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: --that are signed by the Attorney General?

MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Yes. Have you had instances since October 21 of any documents, or have they all pre-dated--

MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: No, pre-dated.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: --October 21.

MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Thanks.

I'm sorry, Senator Baker, and then Senator Schwank.

SENATOR BAKER: Good afternoon. You all operate as your chief law enforcement officer for your individual counties. You are required, under Pennsylvania statute, to be licensed attorneys, and my question would be, if your license were suspended, do you believe that you could stay on the job and continue to effectively do the duties? I know that you have administrative duties, some counties are larger than others where it's more administrative, but you do sign all sorts of warrants, wiretaps, and the like. So my very basic question, if put, as the chief law enforcement officer for your county, if you had a suspended license, could you, in fact, do the duties and serve your community?

MR. HECKLER: I certainly don't believe so. And I've thought about this. Actually, I thought about it just in terms of the Attorney General's situation before I learned

that we were being asked to make a presentation to you folks. Even the most ministerial things that I do, and I am more removed both by virtue of age, you know, when I first left the bench and was elected I made sure I tried one jury trial to prove I could still do it, but I have people who are better at it than me and I'm not in court hardly at all. So you could say what I do is administrative, but virtually every part of it is based on the fact that I'm a lawyer, that I have legal experience on making legal judgments.

I was thinking about the stupidest, most time-wasting ministerial thing I do is the various interstate compacts for the rendition of witnesses and defendants who may be in custody elsewhere require multiple documents to be signed in the original by the prosecuting officer for the jurisdiction that's demanding those people. So I get this stack of papers that, at least in Bucks County, somebody in the sheriff's office has prepared. My people have checked it over. I will read the name on it and we've set up procedures to make sure that I'm not asking for somebody who isn't listed on the trial list, but I'm just signing my name. Doot, doot, doot, doot, doot, doot. Even that, I'm required to do it because I'm the elected--

SENATOR BAKER: So you don't delegate that authority to another individual to handle?

MR. HECKLER: Frankly, it's never been so

burdensome that I've looked into whether I could, but I'm at least given to understand that I can't. Now, I've never taken it up with Seth Williams, I can't imagine that he or Mr.

Zappala sign all the documents that are required for those counties to have a flow, the necessary flow of people, but I sign them individually as the chief prosecuting officer. And even something as ministerial as that, I am accountable. I'm at least responsible to have set up procedures that make sure, in fact, this person is the person that we need, that there's probable cause to proceed against this person if he's being rendered as a defendant, or if he's being rendered as a witness--or she--that we, in fact, need that person in order to prosecute the case. That's all legal judgment.

Budgeting, the bane of many district attorneys.

In fact, over the years I think probably more district attorneys have become judges because they hated dealing with the county commissioners over budgets than any other reason.

And, you would think, what does that got to do with the law?

Well, I have an administrator who puts the budget together who's very good at dealing with the county budgeting people, but my input into it, my ultimate control over it, is based on the needs of my office to do what are purely legal functions.

Who's a good prosecutor? Who do I want to keep versus maybe let go? Who do I want to reward with more money? All of that is based on my life's experience as prosecutor, as a judge, as

a lawyer. So I would be hard-pressed to think of one single thing that I could do.

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

And the other factor, and I don't want to filibuster here, but the other factor that occurred to me, and I'm sure your counsel has looked at this, you'll hear other testimony about it, but I would be very concerned about the position I was putting my people in. Now, you can imagine, I'm an even rarer duck than the average prosecutor because many of the people in my office tried cases before me for 11 years before I gave up a perfectly good judgeship and became DA, as I point out to them. I'm the boss. There is a specific provision of the Rules of Professional Conduct, 5.4(d)(3), that says, "A lawyer shall not practice with or in the form of a professional corporation or association authorized to practice law for profit, if: a nonlawyer has the right to direct or control the professional judgment of a lawyer."

SENATOR BAKER: Do you believe that you could use your title as district attorney if you had a suspended law license?

MR. HECKLER: No.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Yeah, and let me -- let's get opinions from the other two members. If you can, I think the question was geared towards if you, as district attorney, and you had a suspended law license, could you effectively operate

your office as district attorney? So if we can keep to within 1 2 that question so that we're not getting opinions, maybe 3 personal opinions, as to things in the AG's office, unless it is directly related to your operation as district attorney. 4 5 So I think that was the question. 6 MR. HECKLER: No. 7 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: So if the other DAs, again, 8 just I think the question was, if you as a DA--9 SENATOR BAKER: Acting as the chief law 10 enforcement officer. 11 MR. HECKLER: I do not believe that I could give direction to my people who would be in court, who would be 12 doing the work of the office. 13 14 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Okay. So I'd like to hear 15 responses from the other two DAs in regard to that question. 16 And if -- yeah, in regard to that question. 17 MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: Unlike my colleagues, I 18 come from, like I said, a rural county. I'm in the courtroom 19 every day. So from my perspective, could I perform the job 20 for which I was elected to do in Somerset County as the 21 district attorney? I could not. 22 MR. ADAMS: From my perspective in Berks County, 23 and I come from a rather large office, I have approximately 95 24 employees. I rarely go to court, but every day the vast

majority of my function, I am practicing law.

25

And as I prepared for today's hearing and kind of went through the average day that or the average week that I would have as a chief law enforcement officer in Berks County, almost every function and everything that I do involves what I consider the practice of law, and I could not run the office, I could not function as the district attorney, because everything that I'm doing, from charging decisions, from decisions on investigations, from decisions on whether or not we will take a case to a grand jury, decisions on wiretap. have to designate people, I have to sign off on wiretaps. Charging decisions. Every day we're making charging decisions. Every day I'm working with my assistants on plea negotiations. Not a day goes by and not a decision goes by that is not directly related to me being a lawyer. CHAIRMAN GORDNER: District Attorney Lazzari-Strasiser, did you answer, as well? MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: I did. CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Okay, I'm sorry. All right, Senator Baker, do you have further questions? Okay, thank you. Senator Schwank, and then Senator Yaw. SENATOR SCHWANK: Thank you. And thank you all for testifying today. I'm listening to you're discussing the things that you do in your offices, and I admire the work that you

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

do, but a lot of what you're saying, if I'm hearing this correctly, is that this is based on knowledge that you've gained over the years: your legal training, of course, and your many years of practice, perhaps, and then your years in the office, you know, as many as that may be. But would you, if you had a temporarily suspended license, would you be able to function as a district attorney?

And then a second part to that would be, you're talking about how you function as a district attorney. As an Attorney General, could you answer that same question? Do you believe that you could function if you were in that role as Attorney General with a suspended license?

MR. HECKLER: Well, I'll jump in. Frankly, if I were in either position, I suspect, and let's say it was temporary. Let's say I let my CLEs lapse and I had 30 days and then, by gosh, I would be in good standing again. The simple answer is, I believe, I would ask for a leave of absence so that there was no question that my people were running the office. That raises separate philosophical questions about, you know, should I draw salary during that time? I'm the elected official, should I continue with the mandate, although I'm not capable of doing the job? But I think in that situation, frankly, I'd try and look to the Supreme Court or some -- one of the disciplinary committees, somebody, look for precedent, but I think probably you might

not need to hear from us if there were much precedent on this subject, because I would have grave misgivings.

John said it very well: Every decision, everything that we do is based upon what I consider to be the practice of law. Now, the other issue that we get to is, what is the practice of law? That is, you folks are going to be coming to grips with that. You know, God bless you.

know, I was once a Member of the Senate and I find what was going to be my crowning achievement, and I thought when I left it was, was Senate Bill No. 1, the lobbyist regulation law, which got passed just before I left, or just after I left, actually, and was subsequently overturned by the Supreme Court in Gmerek because they said the legislature had intruded upon their right to regulate the practice of law. So they defined even lobbying, when it's done by a lawyer, as something that you folks didn't have the right to regulate. That was exclusively them. Now, since, I think my friend Jeff Piccola figured out a way around that, and you've since enacted similar legislation. But so far as I know, Gmerek is the last expression of that, and it is extremely broad. You're using your knowledge of the law, your experience to advise people.

Obviously, when you go into court, that's practicing law for sure, but the things that we do in supervising our people who do go into court who are the direct

mouthpieces, if you will, for the Commonwealth, it's all based on the fact that we're lawyers, the fact that we've been lawyers, the fact that we have legal knowledge as opposed to any other kind of knowledge.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Go ahead.

MR. ADAMS: I think the question, Senator Schwank, is, would I be able to function? Not me. I'm involved every day. I'm at the scene of crimes, I'm giving advice to police. I have a constant -- constantly, I'm involved in decisions that are being made in my office. And, typically, most decisions of anything of any magnitude are approved by me and/or I'm involved in the discussions with my staff as to those decisions on how a case would be handled and--

SENATOR SCHWANK: And you're using your license to make those decisions?

MR. ADAMS: Yes, I am using my license.

SENATOR SCHWANK: That's what I'm trying to get at.

MR. ADAMS: Yes. And I could not function in any -- I would be totally ineffective and basically I would be on a permanent vacation if I didn't have a law license. My golf game might get better, but that's about it. I'm not going to be able to do my job. You know, as a district attorney, we get phone calls in the middle of the night. We respond to crime scenes. We need to be in touch with law enforcement at

all times when needed, because they are seeking our advice.

You know, while the Attorney General may be insulated a little more because of how vast and how large the office is, ultimately everyone reports to the boss. And in our profession, we are making legal decisions each and every day, and those are being made not only by my assistant district attorneys, my detectives, but ultimately by myself.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: District Attorney

Lazzari-Strasiser?

MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: This just stuck in my head, Attorney Heckler said is it a philosophical question when you address can you -- can we, can I, can these two gentlemen practice in their capacity as district attorney, and you want us to step into the shoes of the Attorney General? I think what I do in my county is far different than what the Attorney General does, just because of size, number of people.

My understanding is that the Attorney General is not precluded from appearing in court, but it's a choice based on how the organization has to be run by an administrator.

But the bottom line, and it almost leads you in a circle, because all weekend I'm thinking who -- I mean, I have, there's two full-time attorneys, including myself, and I have four part-time attorneys with a wealth of knowledge and a tremendous amount of experience in the courtroom and out, but guess who gets called when something goes wrong when one of

them make a decision? They don't get called by the President Judge. I get called by President Judge. So I can't separate my practice of law from theirs. They are acting under my appointment. So if I am not licensed to practice law, if I cannot practice, I still question, how do they do that in my office? Where does the authority come from?

SENATOR SCHWANK: Just one more follow-up.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Sure.

SENATOR SCHWANK: Thank you, Senator Gordner.

Just so I'm clear, it's not just about your management style or how you delegate or not delegate, and depending upon the size of your staff, I can understand that. But is there a legal impediment to you functioning as a district attorney without or with a suspended law license?

MR. ADAMS: Well, let me -- we have some statutory functions which require, and I think you're going to have to ultimately make this decision, but we have some statutory functions, for instance, in the wiretap area where we need to sign approvals, sign documents, and/or we can designate people, but we, by statute, are the only person who has the authority to do certain things under the Wiretap Act. So there are certain qualifications in our positions as an Attorney General, as a district attorney which require us to sign the appropriate documents for certain investigations.

Grand jury is another matter, where I will file a submission,

I will sign the submission. So there are some statutory 1 requirements where I believe that I am practicing law. 2 3 SENATOR SCHWANK: Thank you. 4 MR. HECKLER: If I may, as long as I retain the 5 authority to hire and fire the people who work for my office, I am in charge. I'm controlling their practice of law. 6 7 again, if confronted with that situation, it seems to me the only thing I could do is get myself completely out of the 8 picture. But the problem is, I'm the person who got elected. 9 10 I am the carrier of the mandate. And you can have, you know, 11 if I fall over today, there are people who could take on my functions--first assistant, and so forth--for a period of 12 13 time, but the mandate only comes from the voters, and in order to get elected to either of those positions, you have to be a 14 15 lawyer. 16 SENATOR SCHWANK: Thank you. 17 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Senator Yaw, followed by 18 Senator Haywood. 19 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. SENATOR YAW: 20 We've talked around this a little bit, but I'd 21 just like you to confirm, each of you is a currently licensed 22 attorney, correct? 23 MR. HECKLER: (Indicating in the affirmative.) 24 MR. ADAMS: (Indicating in the affirmative.) 25 MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: Yes, sir.

1 I assumed that, kind of, but nobody SENATOR YAW: 2 asked you, are you? 3 MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: Yes. 4 MR. HECKLER: Yes. And I am smiling because one 5 of my assistants, in speaking with me, said, now, you're 6 caught up on your CLEs and everything, right? You're in good 7 standing? So, yes. 8 MR. ADAMS: Yes, I am, also. SENATOR YAW: You've all said, you know, you were 9 10 elected by the voters. Prior to the time when you were sworn 11 in, you had to meet certain requirements. I don't know whether there's an age requirement for district attorney. 12 Is there anything, you know, to be sworn in, is there anything 13 14 that said that you had to have a license to practice law and 15 be in good standing? 16 MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: A member of the Bar. 17 Pennsylvania Bar. 18 SENATOR YAW: It says you have to be a member of 19 the Bar? 20 MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: Yes. So am I a member of 21 the Bar if my license is suspended? That's exactly the 22 question why we're here. 23 Well, I guess that's my question to SENATOR YAW: 24 you. Would you have qualified to be sworn in at the time if

you had been elected but on the date of swearing in you had a

25

suspended license?

MR. HECKLER: I don't believe so. But, again, it's sort of one of those which came first, the chicken or the egg? The Supreme Court decides, or I think has the ultimate authority as to what constitutes the practice of law; or given the Constitution and the role of this panel, you have the ability to decide that.

SENATOR YAW: If I understand what I think all of you have said, that if you're supervising attorneys, from their perspective, you have to be an attorney, and you have to be an attorney in good standing. I mean, that's the bottom line.

MR. HECKLER: That's my understanding.

SENATOR YAW: One of the issues that's come up, and I'm not sure there's an immediate answer to this, but one of the questions is, if you look at the Attorney General's Office, that all power emanates from the Attorney General to all the deputies, and that if the Attorney General doesn't have the power to exercise all of the rights and privileges and duties of the office, then perhaps none of the deputies do either. That's an issue which I know you raised, is the defense counsel is going to raise, probably they're going to have to raise that issue that whoever is prosecuting their case doesn't have, you know, any legal authority to prosecute them. I don't know who they are. They're just people out

And the reason for that is that otherwise it's going 1 there. to be considered ineffective assistance of counsel. 2 the individual defense attorney may believe that or not, 3 4 probably to protect themselves, they're going to -- that's 5 going to be an issue that's going to be raised in every case, 6 I would think, that the Attorney General is prosecuting. 7 I don't know how many you have, Mr. Adams, how many cases that the Attorney General's Office, or each one of 8 you individually, but the cases from your county, it would 9 10 seem to me, are going to be affected by that particular 11 defense. 12 MR. ADAMS: Well, absolutely. We have a number of 13 cases that the Attorney General is prosecuting because of a 14 conflict, and that is an issue that ultimately I believe our 15 Supreme Court may have to answer that very question when that challenge makes it to that court, because you're correct. 16 17 It's a good point, Senator Yaw. 18 SENATOR YAW: All right, thank you. 19 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 20 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Senator Haywood, and then we'll 21 find out if there's a second round of questions. 22 Senator Haywood. 23 SENATOR HAYWOOD: Thank you. 24 Thank you for your testimony. I've got a number

follow-up questions. With respect to the staff attorney who

25

is concerned about the validity of the drug task force agreement, was the Attorney General a participant in the actual task force investigation?

MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: No, sir. Not directly.

SENATOR HAYWOOD: And agreements that were -- I'm sure there's hundreds of agreements that the Attorney General may have signed?

MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: Statewide, I would assume.

SENATOR HAYWOOD: Or even prior Attorneys

General--

MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: Yes

SENATOR HAYWOOD: --prior to this one. So when an Attorney General loses an election and there's a new Attorney General, is there some issue with respect to the agreement that a prior Attorney General has signed, in terms of it continuing to be in effect?

MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: The agreements for the task force have a certain life to them. There's a start date and an end date, and there has to be some action for them to continue based on the progression of the investigation. So, they don't continue indefinitely, which I think would cure any issue with a new elect coming into office, and it would play out in our separate counties, as well. When I took office, I didn't necessarily -- all of the policy and procedures that were in place didn't fail because a new DA came in. I mean, I

certainly had the ability and did change some of those policies and procedures, but I don't think -- it's a legal attack on their lawfulness.

SENATOR HAYWOOD: So, I'm trying to get a better understanding of how the license or lack of license of the Attorney General would have an impact on these multi-county investigations. For the concern that was raised by the staff person, I'm just trying to get a better understanding of how the--

MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: Well, because I only have jurisdiction in Somerset County.

SENATOR HAYWOOD: Yes.

MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: So, my investigations without the joint task force would be limited to Somerset County, and we all know that drugs cross -- they don't have any boundaries. I mean, they don't stay within counties, for particular reasons. So what it does is enables us to collaborate with other agencies, with other law enforcement, share information, and my task force detectives are sworn in to that task force so that they're allowed to cross jurisdictions, and they have conferred that jurisdiction by the Attorney General.

SENATOR HAYWOOD: And since that has happened already, can you just help me understand what the impact of the Attorney General having a license or not today has on--

MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: Well, it's the same thing as when we ultimately prosecute, what will we be facing in the courtroom? Will there be a challenge to that authority? And certainly, the integrity of the office itself.

SENATOR HAYWOOD: Okay, a future challenge is a concern.

MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: Yes.

SENATOR HAYWOOD: I just want to make sure it's present versus future. So that's one question.

Now, let's say the Attorney General or even one of the DAs has, unfortunately, some kind of a car accident or something where you're not in a position to serve for some period of time. Do you have some kind of procedure that would allow the office to continue to function?

MR. HECKLER: The law and the applicable rules, where it's relevant, provide that the first assistant district attorney has the authority to act. The difficulty, and that sort of gets to the question that Senator Yaw was raising, we know what happens if I keel over today. The Bucks County District Attorney's Office will keep ticking along, and there will be legal authority for that. It's why I would feel if my license to practice was brought into question, that I would need at least to seek, again, subject to other issues, seek a leave of absence. I don't believe that any of the provisions, again, heaven forfend if something happens to the Attorney

General, she's gone, car accident or something, there are legal provisions for her successors to go ahead and do the business of the office.

2.2

The problem that you folks are wrestling with is what happens when she doesn't have a law license but she's still very much alive there, able to hire and fire people?

And that's the difficulty.

SENATOR HAYWOOD: Okay, so, you know, we don't really know what she's doing in the office. So we want to be careful about what she is or is not doing, because we don't really know, we don't have information with respect to what she is or is not doing.

MR. HECKLER: Um-hum.

SENATOR HAYWOOD: I think that's what we're looking more narrowly at the question of, can this person remain in the position? So, let me just go maybe to the designation. I think one of the DAs mentioned that for wiretapping is normally something you could do, but I also thought I heard, and maybe I didn't, that you could designate someone to perform that function. Is that the case? Because I got to tell you, I'm really trying to understand, in part, what it is that can be permissibly delegated or designated, so I can see kind of what's in the box and what's not. So is wiretapping one of the things that could be designated or delegated?

MR. ADAMS: There is provisions that must be taken care of to designate other people. And that designation comes from either the Attorney General or the district attorney. However, those designations would have -- should have -- preceded her suspension. I don't know if that took place. But clearly, statutorily we can delegate that authority. However, the district attorney can and the Attorney General can. SENATOR HAYWOOD: Does that also apply to the other features of the list you mentioned, which was the

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

function of charging? Is the charging function one that can also be delegated or designated?

MR. HECKLER: Informations can be signed by the first assistant if the district attorney, for instance, is unable to do so. But the same issue arises: If I've lost my authority, how would I delegate somebody else?

SENATOR HAYWOOD: That's timing, I understand, as to when the delegation is made. Plea negotiation was another item that was mentioned. Is that a function that could be either designated or delegated?

MR. ADAMS: Well, absolutely, yes, it could be. There's no statutory authority for plea negotiations, so that could be delegated.

SENATOR HAYWOOD: Investigations was another item that was mentioned as one. Is that also one that could be designated or delegated?

MR. HECKLER: There isn't a defined specific role in investigations, except to the extent that the investigators derive their authority to act from the district attorney. And just as my colleague from Somerset County described how things work in multi-county or joint Federal investigations within the county, like we have 50-some municipalities, I designate certain police officers to be special county detectives or to have countywide jurisdiction, generally for drug investigations, although now we're doing it for DUI sweeps as well. They derive -- certainly, if my ticket to practice got pulled, their chiefs would be very much concerned. Well, you know, you can't just go out normally, the Municipal Police Officers Jurisdiction Act controls when a police officer has jurisdiction outside of the confines of their township or borough. If their authority derives from me, what happens if my authority is called into question? So as to investigations, depending upon the

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

up.

So as to investigations, depending upon the particular type of investigation, that could present a problem, because I'm not sure that I could delegate—except to the extent that somebody succeeded me—I don't know that I could delegate the authority to appoint special investigators. I just don't know the answer to that.

SENATOR HAYWOOD: So, that would be good to follow

And one last question, following this train. The

1 last item that was mentioned was grand juries. Is that an 2 activity, in terms of leadership, that could be designated or 3 delegated? 4 MR. ADAMS: I believe it could be. 5 MR. HECKLER: Yes, I believe the first assistant 6 could authorize the submission of cases to the grand jury, my 7 understanding. 8 SENATOR HAYWOOD: Thank you very much, Mr. 9 Chairman. And thank you to the panel. 10 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Thank you. We have some follow-up questions. I'll just say, sort of in interim here, 11 12 obviously, there's been a number of questions that have been 13 specifically asked to you as district attorneys in what you 14 can do as district attorneys. There have been some questions 15 that are more opinion-based questions. So, ultimately, we'll 16 have to weigh the answers to those based upon what you 17 factually are able to do or legally able to do and in your 18 opinions on some other issues, as well. 19 So we'll go to a second round of questions. 20 Senator Wiley is deferring to the end, so we'll go to Senator Baker, followed by Senator Schwank. 21 22 SENATOR BAKER: Thank you. I just want to follow

SENATOR BAKER: Thank you. I just want to follow up on the point that both the Attorney General and district attorneys must be lawyers. You've established that. A suspended lawyer, throughout that suspension, is not an

23

24

25

attorney, not a lawyer. So can you lawfully serve once suspended? Yes or no?

MR. HECKLER: Not in my opinion. I haven't had to confront that issue, but again, what I'd look to is to get some guidance from the Supreme Court, who pulled my license to begin with, as to what that actually means, what the practice of law is.

SENATOR BAKER: Just asking for a "yes" or "no."

MR. HECKLER: No, if I can't be a lawyer.

MR. ADAMS: I would agree. I could not. And I think that ultimately when we initially took the oath of office, I'm not certain that that oath could be given if we were not qualified, and I am certain that it would be challenged if it was given to us.

MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: I agree.

SENATOR BAKER: You have occasion to send documentation to the Attorney General's Office in the course of doing business. Do you believe that correspondence is privileged in the dealings with that office, and do you have any concerns about the review of the office utilizing a suspended license of an attorney would have any impact on the protected status of documents or communications that you would have with the Attorney General's Office?

MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: Well, back to the circle, if she has -- if the Attorney General has a suspended license

to practice law, she should not be reading the communication if it's asking for a legal decision.

SENATOR BAKER: Do you have any concern then that the documentation or the interchanges could potentially not be protected in this process?

MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: Certainly.

MR. HECKLER: Hadn't thought about it. My communication is pretty limited.

MR. ADAMS: I have very limited communications also. There merely would be a conflict letter. Every now and then we get correspondence on certain cases of which they are the prosecutor, which are not conflict cases, but they may have jurisdiction. For example, depending if it's insurance fraud where they have, potentially, original jurisdiction and we get correspondence from their office. Although, I'm not certain if I have any issues with that.

SENATOR BAKER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: A question in the interim going back, and I appreciate a number of questions that Senator Haywood asked. In regard to a multi-county drug task force, are those generally ongoing, or do they need to be renewed from time to time? Or if they were approved 10 years ago, are they still fine today?

MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: No, they have limited life. They are designated for a particular period of time.

1 You have a budget that's set forth and you have the county 2 designations that would be part of that joint task force. 3 It's not just, hey, the counties surrounding you if it develops, it's identified, it's targeted. Statistics have to 4 be submitted even to get that joint task force designation. 5 6 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: And there's a written document 7 that's prepared? 8 MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: Yes. 9 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: And it's signed off by the 10 Attorney General's Office? 11 MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: Yes, and my office, and we 12 have to sign secrecy oaths. 13 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Is that a public document then, 14 or it's a private document? 15 MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: Private. 16 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: It's a confidential document. 17 MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: Yes. 18 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Okay. Then I'm probably not 19 going to get what I was going to ask for. 20 MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: Probably not. 21 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Well, then, let me ask you 22 this. Let's say you have a drug task force that is expiring 23 on the last day of November of 2015 and you want to 24 reauthorize it or start with a new document as of December, 25 and you forward that to the Attorney General's Office for

1 approval. Do you know offhand, is that normally signed by the 2 Attorney General, or how is it signed? 3 MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: The joint task force -- it doesn't come from my request. It is something that's 4 5 identified through the Attorney General's Office as warranted 6 or needed, given the particular circumstances in those 7 counties. So I wouldn't send the request. It would come from 8 them. 9 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Okay, but it is a written 10 document that has signatures --11 MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: Yes. 12 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: -- and approvals and 13 authorizations? 14 MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: Yes. 15 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: And, obviously, they last for a while, so there's authorizations that are currently going on 16 that have been issued beforehand but they're ongoing? 17 18 MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: 19 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: All right. 20 Senator Schwank. 21 SENATOR SCHWANK: Thank you. You made mention 22 earlier in the testimony about cases being compromised, you know, as a result of publicity or something of that nature, 23 you know, regarding the office, or the district attorney's 24 office. But one thing that's bothered me a little bit is 25

that, for example, you would go out on an extended medical leave. Would that mean that your office would should down or that your cases would be compromised?

MR. HECKLER: Well, no. There are specific provisions for that for the disability of the district attorney. And if it's a matter of simply not being there, of illness or whatever, that's one issue.

SENATOR SCHWANK: Okay.

MR. HECKLER: And my office would get along, I think at this point, I'm trying to extract myself, get my successor in there, so it would do just fine. The issue, however, with the compromise of cases is that you have at least the public perception of something being wrong and that being an issue that has to be dealt with, particularly with jurors. I'm not sure that you can't, you know, you're liable to have a defense attorney who if you've got a high profile DA argues, hey, this is another notch in his pistol grips, or whatever. People are free, particularly in defense, to make all kinds of arguments and you deal with them, and voir dire is one of the places you deal with them to just make sure the jury is going to be fair-minded about things.

MS. LAZZARI-STRASISER: We brought the issue up, pardon me, before you got here today, about analyzing the suspension as a physical incapacity. You can't compare the two. You would still have, even though your physical

incapacity, you would still have a license to practice law.

And you are not able to lawfully delegate or perform your duties because of your physical incapacity. That's not the case here. That's not what's happened.

So I appreciate Senator Haywood, because we did have that discussion this morning, but you can only go so far in the analogy, and then the two separate.

MR. ADAMS: And I think what we're trying to convey to this panel is that there is difference if we had a disability or if we were incapacitated, we would not be in the office, but it's incapacity versus suspension, and I think there are some statutory mandates if we are incapacitated. I don't think we've ever had to deal with the issue of versus suspension.

SENATOR SCHWANK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Senator Yaw, followed by Senator Haywood.

SENATOR YAW: Thank you. I've listened to this panel, and it's been a great panel, from my perspective, because we have three different ways, I don't know whether the DAs Association or who picked you, but we have Somerset County, where you're a real hands-on, you're in court virtually every day; we have Bucks County, where you're basically an administrator, and then we have Adams County where you do both--

MR. ADAMS: Berks County.

SENATOR YAW: Or, I'm sorry, Berks County.

MR. HECKLER: Adams from Berks.

SENATOR YAW: So you're kind of a hybrid. So we have an across-the-board perspective of how you operate your office. A friend of mine who is a district attorney said the district attorney is the best office in the county because you can do basically whatever you want, and that's kind of what I get out of this, is that you can run this office however you want. If you choose to be strictly an administrator, that's fine. That's your choice. You want to run a hybrid office, that's your choice, or if you want to be in court every day, that's also your choice.

But what I've gathered out of what you said, and you can disagree with me, because this is kind of what I've gathered out of this, is that you can run the office any way you want, as far as your court appearances and what you do. But the bottom line is, you have to have the legal ability to do all of the functions of your job. And Mr. Heckler, even if you don't like to go to court, the bottom line is, you have to be able to go to court to do all the functions of your job.

MR. HECKLER: Absolutely. And let me correct that, I love court and being in court. However, and actually, the death knell for me was the enterprise that Senator Baker was very -- in fact, I remember sitting where you are, the

task force. I tried my first case, assigned myself another, that turned into a plea, and then the Governor appointed me to chair the Task Force on Child Abuse, and after that we spent a year lobbying the results of that, and that pretty well put paid to my -- I've actually threatened going back. So I enjoy it, but I've got, frankly, people who are better than me to try the big cases, and, you know, what's the DA doing trying little cases? So, again, it's the dynamic of the office, but you have it right, so far as I'm concerned.

SENATOR YAW: All right, thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Senator Haywood, followed by Senator Wiley.

SENATOR HAYWOOD: Thank you. I wanted to follow up a little bit more with the disability and why the disability framework doesn't apply. And I heard what you said about disability, but I guess I didn't comprehend it. What would you say is the authority that a disabled lawyer has that is higher than the authority that a suspended lawyer has?

MR. HECKLER: I don't know that I'd put it higher. It would depend on the extent of your disability. If you're in a coma, then we have a process of succession. So, the first assistant essentially becomes the district attorney and makes the decisions. If you have both of your legs broken and you can't get in to work, but you can communicate with your

first assistant and others, if your intellect is not impaired, you may very well be able to keep on doing things, even though you're not around to sign documents and do sort of mechanical things. You may still very much be in charge.

The dilemma, again, I don't know, if you read

Gmerek, I'm not sure what the practice of law means in all of
its aspects, but when you say that somebody can no longer
practice law, they're still walking, talking, able to hire and
fire, which is a very huge issue if you work for them, but
they don't, as we describe it, as we perceive it, everything
we do with regard to our office involves our being lawyers.
So, somebody has artificially said that this person who is
still elected is walking, talking, hiring and firing, doesn't
have the -- is not a lawyer. It's a conundrum, but it's a
whole different situation from somebody either being flat in a
coma or maybe unable to come to work but able to communicate
with their subordinates and be more or less in charge of
what's going on.

SENATOR HAYWOOD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Senator Wiley.

SENATOR WILEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you again for your testimony today. We truly appreciate your input. It's very valuable to us in getting your perspective. I just have a couple of quick comments. The task that this committee is to wrangle with

really comes down to what the Attorney General can do with a suspended law license or what she cannot do with a suspended law license. And what we're finding, at least what I'm finding, and in some of Senator Haywood's testimony, is that a large percentage of what is done by you or by the Attorney General is administrative in nature, and a large percentage of what you do can be delegated to a subordinate.

Where I get caught up in is having, once an individual is suspended, has a suspended license, they do not lose their experiences. They do not lose their knowledge of the legal system. They do not lose their managerial expertise. So, the administrative component of what we're looking at is not jeopardized, in my opinion, at least from what I've heard today, does not seem to be jeopardized by the suspension of a license.

So, again, this is the first of many conversations that we will be having and wrangling with this issue, but from what I understand, and from your testimony today, and I really, truly appreciate you giving us a perspective from the district attorney's perspective, that the impact on your offices to date since October 21 has not been significant, if at all. And a lot of what we heard today, rightly so, was "should" and "could" do this. So, it allows us a perspective, it allows us some information to bring back, but I think that we have a lot of work to do and we have a large task to

uphold.

So, I appreciate your testimony and I appreciate the information, and thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: All right, as Chair of the committee, I want to thank the three of you for testifying today and giving us a lot of good information. I appreciate that very much.

To the viewing audience and those that are here, you can see that we do have a Website that is up and running. There is an e-mail process that if there's something useful that you think that we should have, you can e-mail us that information.

This is our first hearing. It is not anticipated to be our last hearing. At this point, it is hopeful that we will have our second hearing next week. We will let you know specifically what day and time. It will probably be in this room as well, but stay tuned for that.

With that, I will call this meeting to recess to the call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, the proceedings were recessed at 2:19 p.m.)

I hereby certify that the proceedings are contained 1 fully and accurately in the notes taken by me during the 2 3 hearing of the within cause, and that this is a true and 4 correct transcript of the same. 5 6 7 8 9 ANN-MARIE P. SWEENEY Chief Official Reporter 10 Senate of Pennsylvania 11 12 13 14 THE FOREGOING CERTIFICATION DOES NOT APPLY TO ANY REPRODUCTION OF THE SAME BY ANY MEANS UNLESS UNDER THE DIRECT 15 16 CONTROL AND/OR SUPERVISION OF THE CERTIFYING REPORTER. 17 18 19 20 ANN-MARIE P. SWEENEY 21 Chief Official Reporter 22 Senate of Pennsylvania Room 644, Main Capitol Building 23 Harrisburg, PA 17120 (717)787-420524 25

## EXHIBITS

## TESTIMONY BEFORE THE PENNSYVLANIA SENATE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SENATE ADDRESS November 9, 2015

District Attorney David Heckler, Bucks County

District Attorney John Adams, Berks County

District Attorney Lisa Lazzari-Strasiser, Somerset County

Good Afternoon, and thank you for inviting us to speak with you. We very much appreciate the confidence you have in us to speak to you today about very serious issues regarding the Attorney General. This is a bipartisan undertaking, and we too are a bipartisan panel.

At the outset, we want to be clear that we are here neither to pass judgment on the ultimate question before you regarding the Attorney General nor to even recommend how you should go about considering the different facts you will hear. Instead, we want simply to be factual and to provide you with the information that you need.

You have asked us to address two issues. First, you have asked us to discuss the process by which we refer cases to the Attorney General's Office when there is an actual or apparent conflict of interest. By way of background, the Commonwealth Attorney's Act provides a procedure for referring such cases to the Attorney General's Office, and the Office then determines whether to accept the referral. We have heard from some of our colleagues that the Office has taken a more narrow interpretation of what constitutes a conflict of interest. There is nothing untoward or unethical about these determinations, which are typically made by staff. They are interpretations of the law, no doubt made in good faith. But the decisions have left some of our colleagues in situations where their offices must handle a case that, in their opinion, is better suited to be handled by a different office. We believe there is a legislative solution, which should be incorporated in any bill to reauthorize the Commonwealth Attorney's Act, that would allow for referral to a neighboring county or other county when referral to the Attorney General's Office is declined.

Second, you have also asked us to discuss what we as elected district attorneys do professionally that, in our determination, requires a law license. We hope to provide you the specific details about the tasks and obligations of our jobs that we believe require a law license, and by contrast what would not require a license. We represent different counties of different sizes with different issues. Therefore, we will speak from our perspective as elected district attorneys of our own counties and offer our thoughts as they would pertain to our own practice of law. Ultimately, we leave it to you to make any determinations and conclusions based on what you hear from us and others.

At the end of today, we hope that we will have been helpful in providing the information you need. That is our only interest here. We thank you again for the confidence you have placed in us in asking us to speak with you today.