



United States

Office of Government EthicsSuite 500, 1201 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005 3917

October 8, 1992

Harry H. Flickinger
Assistant Attorney General
for Administration
Department of Justice
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Flickinger:

This is in response to your letter (with its enclosures) of October 2, 1992. By your letter, you request a Certificate of Divestiture pursuant to I.R.C. §1043 for William S. Sessions, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation. Your request relates to shares of AT&T, which were sold on August 5, 1992.

The legislative history of section 1043 demonstrates the congressional intent that this Office is not authorized to issue a Certificate of Divestiture in the case of property previously owned by a public official under the Ethics Reform Act of 1989, which promulgated new provisions that were enacted on November 30, 1989. Subsequently, further provisions were adopted to provide for the application of section 1043 mechanism to apply to certain sales prior to the issuance of certificates. The limited instances to which this procedure could pertain are described in section 4 (a)(2) and (3) of the 1990 Technical Amendments to the Ethics Reform Act of 1989. The authority of this Office to issue Certificates of Divestiture in such circumstances ceased as of June 18, 1990. There is no longer any authority for this Office to issue a certificate relating to property no longer owned.

Even if we exceeded our authority to issue certificates as you request, it would not help the situation of Director Sessions. An examination of the tax deferral mechanism shows the futility, if not absence of ameliorative legislation, of issuing certificates in situations such as his where the property has already been sold. That subsection (a) of section 1043 provides that the tax deferral mechanism, the basis adjustment, applies only to property purchased by the taxpayer during the 60-day period beginning on the date of such sale. From your submission it appears that permitted property was not purchased by Director Sessions during the statutorily mandated 60-day period.

You should further note that even the relief legislation in the Technical Amendments required that in the case of a certificate issued prior to the sale the sale must have occurred in order to comply with an ethics agreement (as required by section 110(a) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1976, as amended).

Harry H. Zickinder
Page 2

"pursuant to specific direction". This requirement supports the
 of section 1043 in mandating that qualifying sales be made
 in fulfillment of specific antecedent determinations by ethics
 program officials as to the appropriateness of the divestiture
 remedy. In the case you raise, the sale was pursuant to an
 individual determination by Director Sessions. Accordingly, he
 could not have qualified under the standards of the relief
 legislation.

If you have further questions regarding this matter, please
 contact Norman Smith of this Office at 202-523-5757 ext. 1109.

Sincerely,

Stephen D. Potts
 Stephen D. Potts
 Director