

CRS Report for Congress

House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct: A Brief History of Its Evolution and Jurisdiction

Updated November 25, 2008

Mildred Amer
Specialist in American National Government
Government and Finance Division



Prepared for Members and
Committees of Congress

House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct: A Brief History of Its Evolution and Jurisdiction

Summary

This report provides a history of the creation and evolution of the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. Also known as the House Ethics Committee and the Committee on Standards, it was first established as a select committee in 1966. It became a standing committee in 1967, and has undergone two major reorganizations, one in 1989 and the other in 1997.

This 10-member, bipartisan committee is authorized to (1) recommend to the House of Representatives actions that would establish or enforce standards of official conduct; and (2) investigate alleged violations by House Members, officers, and employees of any law, rule, regulation, or standard of official conduct relating to their official duties. The committee may, after several stages in an investigative process, recommend any appropriate sanctions, including expulsion of a Member.

The committee also has jurisdiction over the House Code of Official Conduct and is assigned responsibility for administering the gift, outside earned income, financial disclosure and travel, and other regulations established by House rules, the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, the Ethics Reform Act of 1989, and the Honest Government and Open Leadership Act of 2007.

A substantial part the committee's work is advisory and done by its Office of Advice and Education, established to provide information and guidance to House Members, officers, and employees on standards of conduct applicable in their official capacities. This office also conducts educational briefings on laws and the House rules of conduct, and responds to requests for advisory opinions.

In 1975, the committee announced its first disciplinary case against a Member of the House. Since then, it has taken some form of public action on cases involving at least 82 other Representatives, ranging from public acknowledgment that it had considered, but dismissed, a complaint against a Member; to the noting of infractions not meriting sanctions; to the issuance of a formal, public "Letter of Reproval" or a "Letter of Admonition" or a public admonishment from the committee; to the recommendation of censure, reprimand, or expulsion by the House.

In the 110th Congress, the House established the independent Office of Congressional Ethics (H.Res. 895) to initiate investigations of and review alleged violations of House rules and applicable laws by Members and staff. When warranted, this office must refer its findings and recommendations (without any conclusions on the validity of any allegations) to the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct for further action. The committee maintains the final authority to discipline Members and employees as well as its prerogative to initiate investigations.

For additional information please refer to CRS Report RL30764, *Enforcement of Congressional Rules of Conduct*, by Mildred Amer.

Contents

Introduction	1
Recent Developments	3
Evolution and Background	5
Jurisdiction	8
Changes in Jurisdiction	9
Changes in Procedures	11
2008 Changes	11
2005 Changes	12
1997 Changes	13
1989 Changes	14
Miscellaneous Changes	15
Disciplinary Cases	16

List of Tables

Table 1. Congressional Committee Assignments	
House Standards of Official Conduct Committee	21

House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct: A Brief History of Its Evolution and Jurisdiction

Introduction

The House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct was established in the 90th Congress by H.Res. 418 on April 13, 1967.¹ Rules of the House of Representatives designate the committee to meet the key elements of its responsibility for self-discipline as authorized by Article I, Section 5 of the Constitution, which states in part that “Each House may determine the Rules of its proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behaviour, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member.”

The committee has jurisdiction over the House Code of Official Conduct and is assigned responsibility for administering the gift, outside earned income, and financial disclosure requirements established by House rules, the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (P.L. 95-521), the Ethics Reform Act of 1989 (P.L. 101-194), and the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007 (P.L. 110-81).²

This 10-member, bipartisan committee, often referred to as the House Ethics Committee or House Standards Committee, is authorized to (1) recommend actions that would establish or enforce standards of official conduct; and (2) investigate alleged violations by House Members, officers, and employees of any law, rule, regulation, or standard of official conduct relating to their official duties.³ After

¹ *Congressional Record*, vol. 113, April 13, 1967, pp. 9426-9448. See also U.S. Congress, Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, *House Ethics Manual*, 110th Cong., 2nd sess. (Washington: GPO, 2008), pp. 4-8; and [http://ethics.house.gov/Media/PDF/2008_House_Ethics_Manual.pdf], visited October 25, 2008.

² The committee periodically publishes a comprehensive *Ethics Manual* and issues supplementary memoranda to assist Members, officers, and employees in interpreting the various ethics laws, rules, and regulations. The most recent *Manual* was published during the 110th Congress. U.S. Congress, Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, *House Ethics Manual*, 110th Cong., 2nd sess. (Washington: GPO, 2008); and [http://ethics.house.gov/Media/PDF/2008_House_Ethics_Manual.pdf], visited October 25, 2008. For the most current information on House rules of conduct and guidelines from the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, visit the committee’s website at [<http://www.house.gov/ethics>].

³ House Rule XI, Clause 3(a)(1)(2). The members of the committee are appointed by the leaders of their respective parties. The size of the committee was reduced from 14 to 10 on September 18, 1997, with the adoption of H.Res. 168, which revised the committee’s operation and procedures. When first created, the committee had 12 Members. In the 105th

(continued...)

several stages in an investigative process, the committee may recommend to the House any appropriate sanction, including the expulsion of a Member.⁴

The committee may also report to appropriate federal or state authorities, with the approval of the House or two-thirds of the committee members, any substantial evidence of law violations by a Member or staff.⁵

Pursuant to House Rule X, clause 5(a)(4)(A) and (B); Rule XI, clause 3; and the Ethics Reform Act of 1989 (P.L. 101-194, §803(b), (c), and (e), 103 Stat. 1774), the committee's investigative and adjudicative functions are "bifurcated," or separated.⁶ At the beginning of each Congress, the Speaker and the minority leader appoint a 20-person pool of Members (10 from each party) not serving on the House Standards of Official Conduct Committee, who are then to be available to serve on any investigative subcommittee formed during that Congress.

An investigative subcommittee is the initial phase in the bifurcation process. If this subcommittee finds a violation of House rules has occurred, it then transmits a Statement of Alleged Violations (formal charges) to the chair and ranking member of the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. The chair of the House Standards Committee is then required to appoint an adjudicative subcommittee. The members of this subcommittee are members of the Committee on Standards who were not members of the investigative subcommittee as well as the chair and ranking member of the full committee. The adjudicative subcommittee judges the evidence in the Statement of Alleged Violations and recommends sanctions, if its members concludes they are warranted.

Complaints alleging House rules violations can only be filed with the committee by a Member of the House or the new Office of Congressional Ethics (OCE), discussed below. Complaints not filed by the OCE or Members of the House must have a current Representative certify in writing that the information is in good faith and warrants consideration by the committee. Prior to 1997, members of the public (under certain conditions) as well as Members of the House could file a complaint against a Member, officer, or employee of the House. That changed in September

³ (...continued)

Congress, the committee was not organized until September 1997 because of a comprehensive review of its procedures by a special task force. On January 7, 1997, a Select Committee on Ethics was established to complete an investigation begun by the committee created by the 104th Congress. Most of the committee members from the 104th Congress were appointed to the new select committee, which was to cease to exist upon the final disposition of its investigation or by January 21, 1997. See Rep. Richard Armey, "Rules of the House," *Congressional Record*, vol. 143, January 7, 1997, p. 123.

⁴ House Rule XI, clause 3(a)(1)(2); and U.S. Congress, Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, *Summary of Activities One Hundred Eighth Congress*, 108th Cong., 2nd sess., H.Rept. 108-806 (Washington: GPO, 2005), pp. 56-60.

⁵ House Rule XI, Clause 3(a)(3)

⁶ The bifurcation process has been used in 18 committee investigations.

1997 when the House amended the rule governing complaints filed by individuals who are not Members.⁷

The House, by resolution, may direct the Standards of Official Conduct Committee to conduct a specific investigation. There is also a “statute of limitations” for investigations.⁸

The substantial part of the committee’s work, however, is advisory and done by the Office of Advice and Education, which was established within the committee in January 1990 by the Ethics Reform Act of 1989 (P.L. 101-194).⁹ This office is responsible for providing information and guidance to House Members, officers, and employees on standards of conduct applicable in their official capacities. The office also responds to requests for advisory opinions and interpretations of applicable laws, rules, and statutes.¹⁰ Further, the office is now required to offer annual training for Members and staff on the House rules of conduct.¹¹ New staff must receive such training within 60 days of employment.¹²

Recent Developments

During the 110th Congress, after years of discussions about the establishment of investigative and enforcement mechanisms to supplement or replace the two congressional ethics committees,¹³ the House created the Office of Congressional Ethics (OCE) with the adoption of H.Res. 895 on March 11, 2008.¹⁴

This office is empowered to initiate investigations of alleged violations of House rules and applicable laws by Members and staff. When warranted, it can refer

⁷ “Implementing the Recommendations of the Bipartisan Ethics Task Force,” *Congressional Record*, vol. 143, September 18, 1997, pp. 19302-19340.

⁸ The committee is not permitted to investigate, under most circumstances, alleged violations that occurred before the third previous Congress.

⁹ See House Rule XI, Clause 3(a)(4).

¹⁰ Useful information about the committee’s activities and advisory opinions can be found on its website at [<http://www.house.gov/ethics>].

¹¹ House Rule XI, Clause 3(a)(6)(A).

¹² House Rule XI, Clause 3(a)(6)(B).

¹³ For an analysis of creating such entities, as well as the constitutional issues, see CRS Report RL33790, “*Independent*” *Legislative Commission or Office for Ethics and/or Lobbying*, by Jack Maskell and R. Eric Petersen.

¹⁴ U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Rules, *Providing for the Adoption of the Resolution (H.Res. 895), Establishing Within the House of Representatives An Office of Congressional Ethics and For Other Purposes*, report to accompany H.Res. 1031, 110th Cong., 2nd sess., H.Rept. 110-547 (Washington: GPO, 2008); “Establishing An Office of Congressional Ethics,” *Congressional Record*, vol. 154, March 11, 2008, pp. H1515-H1536; and Carl Hulse, “House Creates A Panel to Watch Over Lawmakers’ Behavior,” *The New York Times*, March 12, 2008, p. 1. For additional information, refer to CRS Report RL30764, *Enforcement of Congressional Rules of Conduct: An Historical Overview*, by Mildred Amer.

its findings and recommendations (without any conclusions on the validity of any allegations) to the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct for further action. The committee maintains the final authority to discipline Members and employees as well as initiate investigations.¹⁵

On the first day of the 110th Congress, when the House adopted its rules, it added more restrictions on the acceptance of gifts by Members and staff, placed more limits on acceptance of travel expenses from outside sources for “officially connected travel,” and added for more transparency in the disclosures of such travel.¹⁶ Included in the new rules are a ban on all gifts from lobbyists (Rule XXV, clause 5(a)); and a clarification that tickets to sporting events are to be valued at “face” value or at what the general public would pay (Rule XXV, clause 5(a)). The new rules clarified further the limits on the acceptance from private sources of expenses for “officially connected” travel (House Rule XXV, clause 5(b)) and require Members and staff who accept such travel to receive prior approval from the House Standards Committee and to certify to the committee before traveling that lobbyists would not be involved in any way (Rule XXV, clause 5(d)). The rules mandate that the committee develop standards for reasonable expenses incurred by Members and staff for private, “officially connected” travel (Rule XXV, clause 5(i)).

The new rules also generally prohibit Members and staff from flying on private aircraft other than a plane they own (Rule XXIII, clause 15(b)(2)).

Additional changes to the House ethics rules affecting the Committee on Standards are in the Honest Government and Open Leadership Act (P.L. 110-82) which requires Members and designated staff to notify the committee within three days of the beginning of negotiations for future (post Congress) employment and compensation (House Rule XXVIII).

Also during the 110th Congress, the House passed a resolution requiring the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to act within 30 days when a Member of the House is indicted or otherwise formally charged with criminal conduct in a court of the United States.¹⁷ If the committee does not empanel an investigative subcommittee to review the allegations, it must submit a report to the House describing why it has not done so and detailing what actions, if any, it has taken in

¹⁵ This new office is discussed further in the section of this report entitled “Changes in Procedures.”

¹⁶ H.Res. 6, *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 153, January 4, 2007, pp. H.19-H38. See also CRS Report RS22566, *Acceptance of Gifts by Members and Employees of the House of Representatives Under the New Ethics Rules of the 110th Congress*, by Jack Maskell; and CRS Report RL34166, *Lobbying Law and Ethics Rules Changes in the 110th Congress*, by Jack Maskell.

¹⁷ “Directing the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to Respond to the Indictment of Any Member of the House,” *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 153, June 5, 2007, pp. H5971-H5976, and H5978-H5979.

response to the allegations. This provision has not been incorporated in House rules and will expire at the end of the 110th Congress.¹⁸

During the 109th Congress, on June 7, 2006, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct held a rare open hearing on potential changes in travel guidelines and rules for Members and staff.¹⁹ According to journalistic accounts, the impetus was general interest in lobbying, travel, and gift reform.²⁰

Evolution and Background

Prior to the creation of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and the first House Code of Official Conduct and financial disclosure rule in the 90th Congress (1967-1969), there was no uniform or consistent mechanism for congressional self-discipline.²¹ Some allegations of misconduct were investigated by the House Administration Committee, or, more often, in an ad hoc manner by special or select committees. Election disputes and charges of election fraud were also investigated by special ad hoc committees or other committee and subcommittees. Other allegations were considered by the House without prior committee action. The creation of the Ethics Committee responded to a need for systematizing House responses to questions of official misconduct and Members' need for a reliable, accessible source of information about potential conflicts of interest and other ethical dilemmas that are inherent to serving in Congress.

Ethics committees and standards of conduct for the House as well as the Senate had been suggested since at least the mid-1950s, but it was not until a decade later that these proposals gained sufficient support for enactment.

¹⁸ This information was verified on October 24, 2008, in a telephone call to the office of the House Parliamentarian.

¹⁹ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, [<http://ethics.house.gov/Pubs/Default.aspx?Section=29>], visited October 31, 2008; and Elana Schor, "The House Ethics Committee Solicits Input in Rare Hearing," *The Hill*, June 8, 2006, p. 4.

²⁰ See, Susan Ferrechio, "Scandals Churn Up Strong Winds Behind Efforts to Rewrite Lobbying Rules," *CQ Today*, January 9, 2006, pp. 3, 6; Jeffrey H. Birnbaum, "Hill Weighs Curbs on Lobbying," *The Washington Post*, January 12, 2006, p. A4; and Carl Hulse, "2 Parties Rush to Offer Curbs on Lobbying," *The New York Times*, January 18, 2006, pp. A1, A17.

²¹ In 1958, Congress adopted the Code of Ethics for Government Service, which articulated broad ethical guidelines for all government officers and employees, including Members of Congress and congressional staff. The Code was adopted as a concurrent resolution (H.Con.Res. 175, July 11, 1958; 72 Stat., Part 2, § B12), rather than a statute. Through the years, however, its impact has been strengthened by the House and Senate Ethics Committees, which have included it as a standard for discipline in several cases. See, for example, U.S. Congress, House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, *Investigation of Certain Allegations Related to Voting on the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003*, report, 108th Cong., 2nd sess., H.Rept. 108-722 (Washington: GPO, 2004), p. 38.

During hearings before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress in 1965, considerable testimony was presented on the ethical conduct of Members; and the need for House and Senate codes of conduct, financial disclosure regulations, and a House Ethics Committee (the Senate had created one in 1964).²² In its final report, the Joint Committee called for the creation of a Committee on Standards and Conduct in the House.²³

In October 1966, shortly after the Joint Committee issued its report, and following publicized allegations of misconduct by former House Education and Labor Committee Chairman Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., the House created the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct (H.Res. 1013).²⁴

As reported, H.Res. 1013 granted the select committee powers similar to those ultimately given the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.²⁵ The resolution was amended on the floor, however, and the select committee's powers were limited to (1) recommending additional House rules or regulations necessary to insure proper standards of conduct by House Members, officers, and employees; and (2) reporting violations of law, by majority vote, to the proper federal and state authorities. Like the current committee, the select committee's membership was to be bipartisan.

Because of the brevity of the select committee's existence (October 1966 to January 1967), the members of the committee concluded that they could not "prudently recommend changes in existing provisions of law or recommend new ones at this time."²⁶ Instead, they recommended that (1) the committee be continued as a select committee in the 90th Congress; (2) legislation introduced in the 90th Congress on standards and conduct should be referred to the select committee; and (3) Members of the House should be asked for suggested changes in existing statutes. Included in the report was a draft resolution for continuation of the select committee.

During the first session of the 90th Congress, numerous resolutions were introduced to provide for the establishment of a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct. The House Rules Committee held hearings on these proposals early in 1967, and subsequently reported H.Res. 418, which provided for the creation of a

²² U.S. Congress, Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, *Index to Hearings Before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress*, pursuant to S.Res. 2, hearings 89th Cong, 1st and 2nd sess, various dates 1965 and 1966, part 16 (Washington: GPO, 1966), p. 45.

²³ U.S. Congress, Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, *Organization of Congress*, final report pursuant to S.Res. 2, 89th Cong., 2nd sess., S.Rept. 89-1414 (Washington: GPO, 1966), p. 48.

²⁴ *Congressional Record*, vol. 112, October 19, 1966, pp. 27713-27730.

²⁵ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Rules, *Creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct*, report to accompany H.Res. 1013, 89th Cong., 2nd sess., H.Rept. 89-2012 (Washington: GPO, 1966).

²⁶ U.S. Congress, House Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, *Report Under the Authority of H.Res. 1013*, 89th Cong., 2nd sess., H.Rept. 89-2338 (Washington: GPO, 1966).

standing committee to be known as the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.²⁷

H.Res. 418, which was adopted on April 13, 1967, established a 12-member, bipartisan Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.²⁸ Its sole function was to recommend changes in laws, rules, and regulations that were needed to establish and enforce House standards of official conduct. The first members of the committee were appointed shortly thereafter.

The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct held its first hearings in the summer of 1967.²⁹ Subsequently, it issued a report recommending

- continuation of the committee as a select committee;
- changes in the committee's jurisdiction and powers;
- creation of a Code of Official Conduct and financial disclosure rules for Members, officers, and employees of the House;
- establishment of standardized controls by the House Administration Committee over committees using counterpart funds (foreign currencies held by U.S. embassies that can only be spent in the country of origin);
- a prompt review of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act (reporting of campaign expenditures) by the House; and
- compliance by House candidates with applicable provisions of the Code of Official Conduct.³⁰

Pursuant to this report, the House Rules Committee reported H.Res. 1099, which contained many of these recommendations.³¹ That resolution was amended

²⁷ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Rules, *Establishment of a Standing Committee to be Known as the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, and for Other Purposes*, report to accompany H.Res. 418, 90th Cong., 1st sess., H.Rept. 90-178 (Washington: GPO, 1967).

²⁸ *Congressional Record*, vol. 113, April 13, 1967, pp. 9426-9448.

²⁹ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, *Standards of Official Conduct*, hearings, 90th Cong., 1st sess., August 16-17, 23-24, 1967, and September 14, 21, 27, 1967 (Washington: GPO, 1967).

³⁰ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, *Code of Conduct for Members and Employees of the House*, report under the authority of H.Res. 418, 90th Cong., 2nd sess., H.Rept. 90-1176 (Washington: GPO, 1968).

³¹ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Rules, *Amending H.Res. 418, 90th Congress, to Continue the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct as a Permanent Standing Committee of the House of Representatives, and for Other Purposes*, report to accompany H.Res. 1099, 90th Cong., 2nd sess., H.Rept. 90-1248 (Washington: GPO, 1968).

and adopted by the House on April 3, 1968.³² It provided for (1) continuation of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct as a permanent standing House committee; (2) enumeration of the committee's jurisdiction and powers; (3) the first House Code of Official Conduct (Rule XLIII); and (4) the first financial disclosure requirements for Members, officers, and designated employees (Rule XLIV).³³

Jurisdiction

H.Res. 1099 authorized the committee to (1) recommend to the House legislative or administrative actions deemed necessary for establishing or enforcing standards of conduct; (2) investigate allegations of violations of the Code of Official Conduct or any law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct applicable to Members, officers, and employees in the performance of official duties, and after notice and a hearing, recommend to the House appropriate action; (3) report to appropriate state and federal authorities, subject to House approval, evidence of violations of law by Members, officers, and employees in the performance of official duties;³⁴ and (4) issue and publish advisory opinions for the guidance of Members, officers, and employees.

The committee was also given jurisdiction over measures relating to the House Code of Official Conduct and financial disclosure. In addition, H.Res. 1099 imposed several limitations on the Ethics Committee. These limits, except where noted, are still in effect in House Rule XI, clause 3(a). They stipulate that:

- there must be an affirmative vote of seven out of 12 committee members for the issuance of any report, resolution, recommendation, or advisory opinion relating to the official conduct of a Member, officer, or employee or the investigation of such conduct;³⁵
- investigations, other than those initiated by the committee, can be undertaken only upon receipt of a complaint, in writing and under oath, from a Member of the House, or an individual not a Member if the committee finds that such complaint has been submitted by the

³² *Congressional Record*, vol. 114, April 3, 1968, pp. 8776-8812.

³³ Only a portion of the disclosures required by this two-part rule was to be available to the public.

³⁴ With the adoption of H.Res. 168 (105th Cong., 1st sess.) on September 18, 1997, the House voted to permit an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the full Standards Committee or the approval of the House for the referral of evidence of violations of law to the appropriate law enforcement authorities. Previously, this referral authority had been granted only to the Select Committee on Ethics for one year (1966) and later to only the full House, although reformers for many years had advocated giving it back to the committee.

³⁵ This seven Member requirement was replaced in 1974 with "an affirmative vote by a majority of the members of the committee" to accommodate any subsequent changes in the committee's size. In 1991, pursuant to the Ethics Reform Act of 1989, the membership was increased to 14. However, in 1997, with the adoption of the recommendation of the Ethics Reform Task Force (H.Res. 168), the membership was reduced to 10.

individual to no fewer than three Members who have refused in writing to transmit the complaint to the committee;³⁶

- investigations of alleged violations of any law, rule, etc., that was not in effect at the time of the alleged violation are prohibited;³⁷ and
- members of the committee are not eligible to participate in any committee proceeding relating to their official conduct.³⁸

H.Res. 1099 also empowered the committee to hold hearings, receive testimony, and issue subpoenas in the course of conducting an investigation.

Changes in Jurisdiction

On July 8, 1970, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct was given jurisdiction over lobbying activities as well as those involving the raising, reporting, and use of campaign funds.³⁹ Subsequently, pursuant to the adoption of the House rules for the 94th Congress (1975-1977), jurisdiction over campaign contributions was transferred to the House Administration Committee.⁴⁰ With the adoption of the House rules for the 95th Congress (1977-1979), jurisdiction⁴¹ over lobbying was transferred to the House Judiciary Committee, and its jurisdiction over measures relating to financial disclosure was transferred to the House Rules Committee.⁴²

On March 2, 1977, in the 95th Congress, the House adopted H.Res. 287, which contained several amendments and additions to the House rules of conduct.⁴³ Included were the first House public financial disclosure rule and limits on outside earned income and unofficial office accounts as well as limitations on gifts, the franking privilege, and foreign travel. Pursuant to H.Res. 287, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct assumed jurisdiction over these additional rules of

³⁶ H.Res. 168, adopted September 18, 1997, changed the requirements for the filing of complaints by non-Members to require that such complaints be transmitted by a Member who “certifies in writing to the committee that he or she believes the information is submitted in good faith and warrants the review and consideration of the Committee.”

³⁷ This rule was expanded by the Ethics Reform Act of 1989 to include a statute of limitations of three previous Congresses for investigations of alleged violations.

³⁸ Provisions were made for the Speaker to replace the Member for the duration of any such case. In 1977, the House rules were also amended to provide a mechanism for a committee member to disqualify himself/herself from participating in an investigation in which he/she states in writing and under oath that he/she cannot render an impartial decision.

³⁹ *Congressional Record*, vol. 116, July 8, 1970, pp. 23136-23141.

⁴⁰ *Congressional Record*, vol. 121, January 14, 1975, p. 20.

⁴¹ *Congressional Record*, vol. 123, March 9, 1977, pp. 6811-6817.

⁴² *Congressional Record*, vol. 123, January 4, 1977, p. 53. Note, the committee still has substantive jurisdiction over financial disclosure pursuant to the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (P.L. 95-521).

⁴³ *Congressional Record*, vol. 123, March 2, 1977, pp. 5885-5953.

conduct and was authorized to maintain the public financial disclosure reports filed by Members, officers, and designated employees.⁴⁴ In addition, a Select Committee on Ethics, chaired by Representative Richardson Preyer (D-NC), was established to assist in the implementation of the new rules.

On July 14, 1977, a resolution establishing the House Intelligence Committee authorized the Committee on Standards to investigate any unauthorized disclosure of intelligence or intelligence-related information by a House Member, officer, or employee and report any substantiated allegations to the House.⁴⁵

In August 1977, with the enactment of P.L. 95-105, which amended the Foreign Gifts and Decorations Act of 1966, the committee was designated as the “employing agency” for the House and authorized to issue regulations governing the acceptance by House Members and personnel of gifts, trips, and decorations from foreign governments.

In 1978, government-wide public financial disclosure requirements were mandated with the enactment of the Ethics in Government Act (P.L. 95-521). Subsequently, with the adoption of the House rules for the 96th Congress (1979-1981), the provisions of the House financial disclosure rule were replaced by those of the Ethics Act and incorporated into House rules.⁴⁶ This act delegated to the Committee on Standards review, interpretation, and compliance responsibilities for the public financial disclosure reports that henceforth were to be filed with the Clerk of the House.

Subsequently, the Ethics Reform Act of 1989 (P.L. 101-194), which amended the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, included a variety of ethics and pay reforms for the three branches of government that further expanded the responsibilities of the House Committee on Standards.⁴⁷ These included enforcement of the act’s ban on honoraria, limits on outside earned income, and restrictions on the acceptance of gifts. The committee was also given the responsibility for consideration of any requests for a written waiver of the limits imposed by the House gift ban rule.

⁴⁴ In 1989, the office of the Clerk of the House became the repository for House public financial disclosure reports.

⁴⁵ *Congressional Record*, vol. 123, July 14, 1977, pp. 22932-22949.

⁴⁶ *Congressional Record*, vol. 125, January 15, 1979, p. 9.

⁴⁷ The Ethics Reform Act, which passed the House on November 16, 1989, and was signed into law (P.L. 101-194) on November 30, 1989, also mandated certain changes in the committee’s procedures, *infra*. See U.S. Congress, House, *Report of the Bipartisan Task Force on Ethics on H.R. 3360*, committee print, 101st Cong., 1st sess. (Washington: GPO, 1989), pp. 9-11, 16-21. See also *Congressional Record*, vol. 135, November 16, 1989, pp. 29469-29509.

Changes in Procedures

2008 Changes. On March 11, the House created the Office of Congressional Ethics (OCE), an independent House office to review and submit formal complaints of wrongdoing (without any conclusion on their validity) to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.⁴⁸ H.Res. 895 amended the procedural rules of the Committee on Standards (House Rule XI, clause 3). The action followed the recommendations of the Special Task Force on Ethics Enforcement, established by Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi and Republican Leader John Boehner in January 2007 to consider whether the House should create an “outside” ethics enforcement entity.⁴⁹ Chaired by Representative Michael Capuano, the task force held a number of executive briefings and, on April 19, 2007, a public hearing.⁵⁰

H.Res. 895 established the OCE, composed of six board members jointly appointed by House leaders. Current House Members, federal employees, and lobbyists are not eligible to serve on the board, composed of private citizens with a wide range of professional experience. The board’s responsibility is to review allegations of misconduct by Members, officers, and employees of the House and then, if appropriate, make recommendations to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct for its consideration.⁵¹ Any referrals to the Standards of Official Conduct Committee are to be acted on in accord with the committee’s current rules. The committee is required to make a public announcement of its disposition of certain referrals within specific time frames.

The OCE board is required to act in secrecy on all matters and communicate solely with the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. Final authority to either

⁴⁸ U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Rules, *Providing for the Adoption of the Resolution (H.Res. 895), Establishing Within the House of Representatives An Office of Congressional Ethics and For Other Purposes*, report to accompany H.Res. 1031, 110th Cong., 2nd sess., H.Rept. 110-547 (Washington: GPO, 2008); “Establishing An Office of Congressional Ethics,” *Congressional Record*, vol. 154, March 11, 2008, pp. H1515-H1536; and Carl Hulse, “House Creates A Panel to Watch Over Lawmakers’ Behavior,” *The New York Times*, March 12, 2008, p. 1. For additional information, refer to CRS Report RL30764, *Enforcement of Congressional Rules of Conduct: An Historical Overview*, by Mildred Amer.

⁴⁹ Rep. Michael E. Capuano, “Dear Colleague” letter, December 19, 2007, [<http://www.house.gov/capuano/news/2007/121907ethics/Dear%20Colleague%20Letter.pdf>], visited October 29, 2008; U.S. House, Special Task Force on Ethics Enforcement, [<http://www.house.gov/capuano/news/2007/121907ethics/Ethics%20Report.pdf>], visited October 29, 2008; and Susan Davis, “Pelosi, Boehner Name Eight Members to Ethics Task Force,” *Roll Call*, February 1, 2007, pp. 3, 22. The other Members on the task force were Reps. Robert Scott, Betty McCollum, David Price, Lamar Smith (ranking member), Dave Camp, David Hobson, and Todd Tiahrt.

⁵⁰ U.S. House, Special Task Force on Ethics Enforcement, *Public Hearing on Ethics Process*, 110th Cong, 1st sess., April 19, 2007 (unpublished), [<http://www.house.gov/capuano/news/2007/121907ethics/Hearing%20Transcript%20-%20working.pdf>], visited January 15, 2008.

⁵¹ Former Members and staff of the House could not serve on the board sooner than one year after leaving House employment.

dismiss a case referred to it or to empanel an investigative subcommittee is still the responsibility of the committee, thus keeping authority for any investigation and proposed discipline of a Member or staff under the control of current Members of the House.

No public announcements will be required when neither the board nor the Standards of Official Conduct Committee find wrongdoing. The OCE does not have subpoena power, and no cases may be referred to the Standards Committee within 60 days of an election in which the subject of a referral is a candidate.

The first members of the OCE were appointed in July 2008.⁵²

2005 Changes. On January 4, 2005, when the House adopted H.Res. 5, its rules for the 105th Congress, it included several provisions affecting the Committee on Standards' procedures in handling allegations against a House Member, officer, or employee as well as procedures to be followed when the conduct of Member, officer, or employee might be referenced in the course of an investigation against someone else.⁵³ Subsequently, on April 27, 2005, the changes were dropped when the House deleted all amendments to the committee's procedures that had been adopted earlier in the year.⁵⁴

Other major changes in the composition and rules of procedure of the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct occurred in 1989 and 1997.⁵⁵

⁵² Speaker of the House, "Pelosi, Boehner Announce Appointments to New Office of Congressional Ethics," press release, July 24, 2008, [<http://speaker.house.gov/newsroom/pressreleases?id=0762>], visited October 29, 2008; and Molly Hooper, "House Leaders Make Selection for Six-Member Outside Ethics Board," *CQ Today*, July 25, 2009, p. 7. The members are former Representatives David Skaggs (chair), Porter Goss (vice chair), Karan English, and Yvonne Braithwaite Burke, former House CAO Jay Eagen, and former professor and chief of staff of the Federal Election Commission Allison Hayward. The alternates are former Representative and federal judge Abner Mikva and former Representative Bill Frenzel.

⁵³ "Rules of the House," *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 151, January 4, 2005, pp. H7-H31.

⁵⁴ "Amending the Rules of the House," *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 151, April 27, 2005, pp. H2616-H2626. See also CRS Report RS22034, *House Ethics Rules Changes in the 109th Congress*, by Mildred Amer.

⁵⁵ During the 103rd Congress, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress held two hearings on reform of the congressional ethics process. The most discussed topics included streamlining the ethics process and including non-Members as part of that process. No action, however, was taken on any of the committee's recommendations relating to the ethics process. See U.S. Congress, Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, *Organization of the Congress*, Final Report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, 103rd Cong., 1st sess., S.Rept. 103-215, vol. II (Washington: GPO, 1993), pp. 123-129; and U.S. Congress, Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, *Organization of Congress*, Final Report of the House Members of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, 103rd Cong., 1st sess., H.Rept. 103-413, vol. I (Washington: GPO, 1993), pp. 3-4.

1997 Changes. On September 18, 1997, after seven months of study, the House adopted, with amendments, the recommendations of the Ethics Reform Task Force, which had been established in February 1997.⁵⁶ The 10-member task force was mandated to review the existing House ethics process and recommend reforms of that process.⁵⁷ It was chaired by Representatives Bob Livingston (R-LA) and Ben Cardin (D-MD). At the same time that the House approved the establishment of the task force on February 12, it also approved a 65-day moratorium on the filing of new ethics complaints to enable the Task Force to conduct its work “in a climate free from specific questions of ethical propriety.”⁵⁸ That moratorium was extended several times prior to adoption of the task force’s recommendations.

During the course of its deliberations, the task force conducted several days of hearings, the majority of which were held in closed session. Testimony was received from experts in the ethics process, attorneys who had represented respondents before the House Ethics Committee, and Members of the House, some of whom had served on the Ethics Committee.

The major changes in the ethics process adopted by the House on September 18, 1997, included the following:

- altering the way individuals who are not Members of the House file complaints with the committee by requiring them to have a Member of the House certify in writing that the information is submitted in good faith and warrants consideration by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct;⁵⁹
- decreasing the size of the committee from 14 members to 10;
- establishing a 20-person pool of Members (10 from each party) to supplement the work of the Ethics Committee as potential appointees to investigative subcommittees that the committee might establish;⁶⁰

⁵⁶ “Implementing the Recommendations of Bipartisan House Ethics Task Force,” *Congressional Record*, vol. 143, September 18, 1997, pp. 19302-19340.

⁵⁷ *Congressional Record*, vol. 143, February 12, 1997, pp. 2058-2059.

⁵⁸ *Congressional Record*, vol. 143, February 12, 1997, p. 2059.

⁵⁹ This procedure superseded a process whereby individuals who were not Members of the House could file complaints with the Standards Committee only after they had submitted allegations to at least three House Members, who had refused in writing to transmit the complaint to the committee.

⁶⁰ The first pool of 20 Members selected to serve on investigative committees of the Standards Committee was appointed on November 13, 1997. See The Speaker Pro Tempore [Rep. Ray La Hood], “List of Republican and Democratic Members Selected to Serve As ‘Pool’ For Purposed Relating To The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct,” *Congressional Record*, vol. 143, November 13, 1997, p. 26569. The House leadership has subsequently appointed a 20-person pool of Members in each Congress.

- requiring the chair and ranking minority member of the committee to determine within 14 calendar days or 5 legislative days, whichever comes first, if the information offered as a complaint meets the committee's requirements;⁶¹
- allowing an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members of the committee or approval of the full House to refer evidence of violations of law disclosed in a committee investigation to the appropriate state or federal law enforcement authorities;⁶²
- providing for a nonpartisan, professional committee staff;
- allowing the ranking member on the committee to place matters on the committee's agenda; and
- decreasing the maximum service on the committee from six years to four years during any three successive Congresses and required at least four members to be rotated off the committee at the end of each Congress.⁶³

These changes took effect in the 105th Congress. After the members of the committee were appointed for the 105th Congress in September 1997, they voted to carry over three pending cases from the 104th Congress and apply the new procedures to each of those cases.

1989 Changes. The Ethics Reform Act of 1989 (P.L. 101-194) contained provisions affecting the three branches of government and also mandated changes in the House Ethics Committee.⁶⁴ It established the Office of Advice and Education, effective January 1, 1990. This office is part of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, but is separate from its enforcement functions. Its staff offers training, guidance, and provides recommendations to Members, officers, and employees of the House on standards of conduct applicable to their official duties.

Other changes implemented by the 1989 act that are still applicable include:

⁶¹ Previously, there was no specific time limit for this determination.

⁶² With the exception of a brief period in 1966, only a vote by the full House previously permitted referrals of possible violations of law to the appropriate authorities.

⁶³ When the House adopted its rules for the 106th Congress (1999-2001), it changed the committee service rule and also voted to eliminate the rule requiring four members of the Standards Committee to rotate off the committee every Congress. This action returned the committee's service requirement to what it had been after the adoption of the Ethics Reform Act of 1989 (no more than three Congresses in any period of five successive Congresses). See *Congressional Record*, vol. 145, January 6, 1999, p. 54.

⁶⁴ *Congressional Record*, vol. 135, November 16, 1989, pp. 29469-29509.

- “bifurcation” (separation) within the committee of its investigative and adjudicative functions;⁶⁵
- a requirement that the committee report to the House on any case it has voted to investigate and that any Letter of Reprimand or other committee administrative action may be issued only as part of a final report to the House;
- a statute of limitation prohibiting the committee from initiating or undertaking an investigation of alleged violations occurring prior to the third previous Congress unless they are related to a continuous course of conduct in recent years;
- a guarantee that any Member who is the respondent in any Ethics Committee investigation may be accompanied by one counsel on the House floor during consideration of his/her case; and
- a time limit of committee service of no more than three out of any five consecutive Congresses.

The act also increased the size of the committee’s membership from 12 to 14. That change, however, was superseded by the 1997 reforms that reduced the size of the committee from 14 to 10 members.

Miscellaneous Changes. Changes in the committee’s procedures over the last 30 years that remain in effect include the following: (1) on January 3, 1975, at the commencement of the 94th Congress, pursuant to the adoption of the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974, the committee rules were changed to permit a majority vote (instead of 10 of the then-12 members) to approve committee reports, recommendations, advisory opinions, and investigations;⁶⁶ (2) on January 4, 1977, the House adopted a rule permitting a member of the committee to disqualify himself/herself from participating in an investigation upon submission of an affidavit of disqualification in writing and under oath;⁶⁷ and (3) on January 15, 1979, House rules were amended to prohibit information, testimony, and the contents of a complaint or note of its filing from being publicly disclosed unless specifically authorized by the full committee.⁶⁸

⁶⁵ Bifurcation has thus far been implemented in 18 committee investigations.

⁶⁶ *Congressional Record*, vol. 120, October 8, 1974, p. 34470.

⁶⁷ *Congressional Record*, vol. 123, January 4, 1977, p. 53.

⁶⁸ *Congressional Record*, vol. 125, January 15, 1979, p. 8.

Disciplinary Cases⁶⁹

The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has operated cautiously through the years in exercising its disciplinary authority and responsibilities. For example, the committee is careful not to discuss publicly allegations received and those under review before determining their merit or deciding to begin a preliminary inquiry. Committee rules prohibit the chairman and ranking member from making public statements about matters before the Ethics Committee unless authorized to do so by the committee. Members and staff may not disclose any evidence relating to an ongoing investigation unless authorized by the committee. While preserving the authority of the full committee, the ethics reforms adopted September 18, 1997, grant discretion, when appropriate, to the chairman and ranking member to make public statements about matters before the committee.⁷⁰

As granted by House Rules, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has several options at the conclusion of any formal investigation. It may recommend no further House action, issue a “Letter of Reproof”⁷¹ or a “Letter of Admonition”⁷² without recommending action by the full House, or recommend one or more sanctions if it determines a rules violation has occurred. The sanctions that may be

⁶⁹ Visit [http://www.house.gov/ethics/Historical_Chart_Final_Version.htm] for a historical summary of cases provided by the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. There is no single comprehensive official source for documenting all of the cases considered by the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. Good resources include “Congressional Ethics Cases, 1976-1980,” in *Congressional Ethics*, 2nd ed. (Washington: Congressional Quarterly, 1980), pp. 21-47; “Ethics and Criminal Prosecutions,” in *Guide to Congress*, 5th ed., vol. II (Washington: Congressional Quarterly, 2000), pp. 915-988, supplemented by various editions of *Congress and the Nation*, published quadrennially by Congressional Quarterly Inc.; and Mary Ann Noyer, *Catalogue of Congressional Ethics Cases, 1796-1992* (Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1995).

⁷⁰ For example, it may be appropriate to respond to unauthorized press accounts of investigations or to respond to misinformation. See U.S. Congress, House Ethics Reform Task Force, *Report of the Ethics Reform Task Force on H.Res. 168*, committee print, 105th Cong., 1st sess. (Washington: GPO, 1977), pp. 11-12.

⁷¹ A public Letter of Reproof is a sanction created by the committee and first used in 1987. It is an administrative action authorized under the rules of the House and issued as part of a public report from the committee after a formal investigation. It is an expression by the committee that the conduct of a Member, officer, or employee was improper but that no further action is required by the House. Committee rules implemented following the adoption of the Ethics Reform Act of 1989 mandate that any Letter of Reproof or other committee administrative action may only be issued as a final report to the House. The committee has issued five public “Letters of Reproof.”

⁷² The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has resolved several complaints by means of a letter to a respondent without a formal investigation. According to the committee, “In the past such letters have not been formally termed ‘letters of admonition,’ but this term accurately describes the substance of these letters.” Unlike a Letter of Reproof, a Letter of Admonishment is not authorized under House rules. Such a letter was sent to a Member of the House in 2004. See [http://www.house.gov/ethics/Delay_memo.htm], p. 2, and U.S. Congress, Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, *Summary of Activities One Hundred Eighth Congress*, 108th Cong., 2nd sess., pp. 62-68.

recommended include expulsion, censure, reprimand or admonishment;⁷³ a fine, denial or limitation of any right, privilege, or immunity of the Member that is permitted under the Constitution; or any other sanction deemed appropriate by the Ethics Committee.⁷⁴ Typically, the House has supported the committee's recommendations, although it is not required to do so. However, in two instances, the House changed a censure recommendation from the committee to a reprimand; and in two additional instances changed a reprimand recommendation from the committee to censure.⁷⁵

Since its inception, published accounts have indicated that the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has taken some form of action on cases involving at least 83 Representatives, including two Speakers of the House and a Majority Leader.⁷⁶ Its actions have ranged from public acknowledgment that it is considering the merits of a complaint against a Member, to the dismissal of complaint, to the

⁷³ The first admonishments from Committee on Standards of Official Conduct came in 2004 at the conclusion of a formal investigation of allegation related to voting on the Medicare, Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003. In its report, which did not require full House action, the investigative subcommittee noted that "It is the intention of this investigative subcommittee that publication of this report will serve as a public admonishment of ... [the three Members under investigation] regarding their conduct in this matter." See U.S. Congress, Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, *Investigation of Certain Allegations Related to Voting on the Medicare, Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003, report from the Investigative Subcommittee*, 108th Cong., 2nd sess., H.Rept. 108-722 (Washington: GPO, 2004), p. 44.

⁷⁴ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, *Ethics Manual*, p. 11. See also CRS Report RL31382, *Expulsion, Censure, Reprimand, and Fine: Legislative Discipline in the House of Representatives*, by Jack Maskell.

⁷⁵ "Censure Proceedings in the House," in *Guide to Congress*, 5th ed., vol. II (Washington: Congressional Quarterly, 2000), p. 935; and U.S. Congress, House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, "Historical Summary of Conduct Cases in the House of Representatives [<http://ethics.house.gov/Pubs/Default.aspx?Section=15>], visited October 31, 2008. Note that censure, reprimand, or admonition are traditional ways in which parliamentary bodies have disciplined their members and maintained order and dignity in their proceedings. In the House of Representatives, a "censure" is a formal vote by the majority of Members present and voting on a resolution disapproving a Member's conduct, with generally the additional requirement that the Member stand at the "well" of the House chamber to receive a verbal rebuke and witness the reading of the censure resolution by the Speaker of the House. A "reprimand" involves a lesser level of disapproval of the conduct of a Member than that of a "censure," and is thus a less severe rebuke by the institution. It is of relatively recent origin. When the House has reprimanded some Members, adoption of the recommendation of reprimand from the Committee on Standards has constituted the reprimand. For more information, refer to CRS Report RL31382, *Expulsion, Censure, Reprimand, and Fine: Legislative Discipline in the House of Representatives*, by Jack Maskell.

⁷⁶ This number is an informed estimate based on announcements by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct or House Members who have been the subject of any formal or informal inquiry. See also footnote 69.

recommendation of punishments discussed above.⁷⁷ Four Members of the House have been censured, and two expelled following investigations by the committee.⁷⁸

The committee's first announced action was in 1968 at the request of the then-Speaker John McCormack.⁷⁹ This was an inquiry into roll-call voting irregularities that caused some Members who were out of town to be recorded as having voted. The committee concluded that problem was not deliberate and was the result of an overworked tally clerk. It also urged the House to install a modernized system of voting.⁸⁰

The next announced committee action, in 1975, was its first investigation into allegations of misconduct by a Member.⁸¹ After completing its inquiry on this matter in 1976, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct recommended and the House concurred in the reprimand of a Member for financial wrongdoing. This was the first reprimand of a Member of the House, a sanction now viewed as less severe than a censure. Adoption by the House of the committee's report recommending a reprimand constitutes that punishment, while the censure of a Member involves the Speaker reading the committee's finding and censuring the Member, who is required to stand in the well of the House. Since 1976, seven other Members have been reprimanded.

The committee has also noted infractions not meriting sanctions for 12 Members. Twenty-five Representatives have left the House after court convictions, after inquiries were initiated by the committee, or after charges were brought by the committee but before House action could be completed. In each case, the Members' departure has ended their cases because the Ethics Committee does not have jurisdiction over former Members.

In the 97th, 98th, and 109th Congresses the committee conducted investigations concerning the alleged improper relationship of House Members and congressional

⁷⁷ See CRS Report RL30764, *History of Congressional Ethics Enforcement*, by Mildred Amer.

⁷⁸ In some cases, the committee has begun an inquiry, but stopped at the request of the Department of Justice which was also investigating the same Member. See, for example, U.S. Congress, House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, *Summary of Activities One Hundred Third Congress*, 103rd Cong., 2nd sess., H.Rept. 103-873 (Washington: GPO, 1994), pp. 7-8; and U.S. Congress, House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct [<http://ethics.house.gov/Media/PDF/Press%20Statement%20Renzi.pdf>], visited October 31, 2008.

⁷⁹ "Communication from the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct," *Congressional Record*, vol. 115, June 19, 1969, p. 16629; and Richard Lyons, "House Set Probe on Ghost Vote," *The Washington Post and Times-Herald*, October 2, 1968, p. A7.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, and "House Group Urges Roll-Call Reform," *The New York Times*, December 19, 1968, p. 33.

⁸¹ Since this case, the committee has taken some form of public action against 82 other Representatives. This figure is based on information publicly provided by the committee or by Members of the House who were the subject of an inquiry or investigation.

pages.⁸² As a result of the committee's work during 1982 and 1983, two Representatives were censured by the House.⁸³

Near the end of the 109th Congress (2006), after reports of alleged improper communications between a Member of the House and former pages, the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct voted unanimously to "establish an Investigative Subcommittee regarding any conduct of House Members, officers, and staff related to information concerning improper conduct involving Members and Current and Former pages."⁸⁴ The Investigative Subcommittee issued its report on December 8, 2006. Although expressing concern over the conduct of some Members, officers, and employees of the House, it concluded that "no current Members or employees of the House had violated the House Code of Official Conduct."⁸⁵ Although the subcommittee recommended no further investigative proceedings to determine violations of House rules or standards of conduct, it noted that its report

should serve as a strong reminder to Members, officers, and employees of the House that they are obligated to pursue specific and non-specific allegations of improper conduct between a Member or House employee and a participant in the House Page Program.... The failure to exhaust all reasonable efforts to call attention to potential misconduct ... is a present danger to House pages and to the integrity of the institution of the House.⁸⁶

The report also contained recommendations for reforming the operation of the page program.

Also, in the 98th Congress, the committee conducted an investigation of alleged improper alterations of House documents. In the 99th Congress, it conducted an

⁸² See U.S. Congress, House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, *Summary of Activities Ninety-Eighth Congress*, 98th Cong., 2nd sess., H.Rept. 98-1174 (Washington: GPO, 1984), pp. 3-4; and U.S. Congress, House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, *Summary of Activities One Hundred Ninth Congress*, 109th Congress, 2nd sess., H.Rept. 109-744 (Washington: GPO, 2007), pp. 18-20.

⁸³ The Members involved are included in the count of 83 Members who have been the subject of an inquiry/investigation and discipline by the committee and the House.

⁸⁴ "Bipartisan Ethics Committee Launches Investigation of House Page Program Allegations," press release, at [http://www.house.gov/ethics/Press_Statement_Page_Subcomm.htm], visited February 28, 2008; and Charles Babington, "Police Find No Report of A Foley Dorm Incident," *The Washington Post*, October 6, 2006, pp. A1, A4. In addition, the Justice Department and the Florida Department of Law Enforcement also investigated the allegations. See U.S. Congress, House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, *Investigation of Allegations Related to Improper Conduct Involving Members and Current or Former House Pages*, 109th Cong., 2nd sess., H.Rept. 109-733 (Washington: GPO, 2006), pp. 9-10.

⁸⁵ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, *Investigation of Allegations Related to Improper Conduct Involving Members and Current or Former House Pages*, 109th Cong., 2nd sess., H.Rept. 109-733 (Washington: GPO, 2006), pp. 2-3.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

investigation of allegations of improper political solicitations. No Members of the House were implicated in these cases.

In the 102nd Congress, the Ethics Committee considered allegations of impropriety involving the “bank” of the House of Representatives and found 325 current/former Members had overdrafts during the 39-month period of review, but no further action was taken by the House in the “bank” matter. Also in the 102nd Congress, on August 11, 1992, the committee formed a task force to review evidence to determine the necessity of an investigation of the operations of the House post office. The committee deferred any action in the post office matter at the request of the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice has prosecuted some Members and former Members of the House as a result of its investigations into the House “bank” and post office.

**Table 1. Congressional Committee Assignments
House Standards of Official Conduct Committee**

Member	Party	State	District	Began Assignment	Ended Assignment
90th Congress (1967-1969)					
Price, C. Melvin	D	IL	24 th	May 1, 1967	January 2, 1969
Teague, Olin E.	D	TX	6 th	May 1, 1967	January 2, 1969
Evins, Joseph L.	D	TN	4 th	May 1, 1967	January 2, 1969
Abbitt, Watkins M.	D	VA	4 th	May 1, 1967	January 2, 1969
Aspinall, Wayne N.	D	CO	4 th	May 1, 1967	January 2, 1969
Kelly, Edna F.	D	NY	12 th	May 1, 1967	January 2, 1969
Halleck, Charles A.	R	IN	2 nd	May 1, 1967	January 2, 1969
Arends, Leslie C.	R	IL	17 th	May 1, 1967	January 2, 1969
Betts, Jackson E.	R	OH	8 th	May 1, 1967	January 2, 1969
Stafford, Robert T.	R	VT	AL ^a	May 1, 1967	January 2, 1969
Quillen, James H.	R	TN	1 st	May 1, 1967	January 2, 1969
Williams, Lawrence G.	R	PA	7 th	May 1, 1967	January 2, 1969
91st Congress (1969-1971)					
Price, C. Melvin	D	IL	24 th	January 29, 1969	January 2, 1971
Teague, Olin E.	D	TX	6 th	January 29, 1969	January 2, 1971
Abbitt, Watkins M.	D	VA	4 th	January 29, 1969	January 2, 1971
Aspinall, Wayne N.	D	CO	4 th	January 29, 1969	January 2, 1971
Hébert, F. Edward	D	LA	1 st	January 29, 1969	January 2, 1971
Holifield, Chet	D	CA	19 th	January 29, 1969	January 2, 1971
Arends, Leslie C.	R	IL	17 th	January 29, 1969	July 24, 1969
Betts, Jackson E.	R	OH	8 th	January 29, 1969	January 2, 1971
Stafford, Robert T.	R	VT	AL ^a	January 29, 1969	January 2, 1971
Quillen, James H.	R	TN	1 st	January 29, 1969	January 2, 1971
Williams, Lawrence G.	R	PA	7 th	January 29, 1969	January 2, 1971
Hutchinson, Edward	R	MI	4 th	January 29, 1969	January 2, 1971
Reid, Charlotte T.	R	IL	15 th	October 7, 1969	January 2, 1971

Member	Party	State	District	Began Assignment	Ended Assignment
92nd Congress (1971-1973)					
Price, C. Melvin	D	IL	24 th	February 4, 1971	January 2, 1973
Teague, Olin E.	D	TX	6 th	February 4, 1971	January 2, 1973
Abbitt, Watkins M.	D	VA	4 th	February 4, 1971	January 2, 1973
Aspinall, Wayne N.	D	CO	4 th	February 4, 1971	January 2, 1973
Hébert, F. Edward	D	LA	1 st	February 4, 1971	January 2, 1973
Holifield, Chet	D	CA	19 th	February 4, 1971	January 2, 1973
Betts, Jackson E.	R	OH	8 th	February 4, 1971	January 2, 1973
Stafford, Robert T.	R	VT	AL ^a	February 4, 1971	September 16, 1971
Quillen, James H.	R	TN	1 st	February 4, 1971	January 2, 1973
Williams, Lawrence G.	R	PA	7 th	February 4, 1971	January 2, 1973
Hutchinson, Edward	R	MI	4 th	February 4, 1971	January 2, 1973
Reid, Charlotte T.	R	IL	15 th	February 4, 1971	October 7, 1971
King, Carleton J.	R	NY	30 th	October 27, 1971	January 2, 1973
Spence, Floyd D.	R	SC	2 nd	October 27, 1971	January 2, 1973
93rd Congress (1973-1975)					
Price, C. Melvin	D	IL	23 rd	January 24, 1973	January 2, 1975
Teague, Olin E.	D	TX	6 th	January 24, 1973	January 2, 1975
Hébert, F. Edward	D	LA	1 st	January 24, 1973	January 2, 1975
Holifield, Chet	D	CA	19 th	January 24, 1973	December 31, 1974
Flynt, John James Jr.	D	GA	6 th	January 24, 1973	January 2, 1975
Foley, Thomas S.	D	WA	5 th	January 24, 1973	January 2, 1975
Quillen, James H.	R	TN	1 st	January 24, 1973	January 2, 1975
Williams, Lawrence G.	R	PA	7 th	January 24, 1973	January 2, 1975
Hutchinson, Edward	R	MI	4 th	January 24, 1973	January 2, 1975
King, Carleton J.	R	NY	29 th	January 24, 1973	December 31, 1974
Spence, Floyd D.	R	SC	2 nd	January 24, 1973	January 2, 1975
Hunt, John E.	R	NJ	1 st	January 24, 1973	January 2, 1975

Member	Party	State	District	Began Assignment	Ended Assignment
94th Congress (1975-1977)					
Price, C. Melvin	D	IL	23 rd	January 20, 1975	January 2, 1977
Teague, Olin E.	D	TX	6 th	January 20, 1975	January 2, 1977
Hébert, F. Edward	D	LA	1 st	January 20, 1975	January 2, 1977
Flynt, John James Jr.	D	GA	6 th	January 20, 1975	January 2, 1977
Foley, Thomas S.	D	WA	5 th	January 20, 1975	January 2, 1977
Bennett, Charles E.	D	FL	3 rd	January 20, 1975	January 2, 1977
Spence, Floyd D.	R	SC	2 nd	January 28, 1975	January 2, 1977
Quillen, James H.	R	TN	1 st	January 28, 1975	January 2, 1977
Hutchinson, Edward	R	MI	4 th	January 28, 1975	January 2, 1977
Quie, Albert H.	R	MN	1 st	January 28, 1975	January 2, 1977
Mitchell, Donald J.	R	NY	31 st	January 28, 1975	January 2, 1977
Cochran, Thad	R	MS	4 th	January 28, 1975	January 2, 1977
95th Congress (1977-1979)					
Flynt, John James Jr.	D	GA	6 th	January 19, 1977	January 2, 1979
Teague, Olin E.	D	TX	6 th	January 19, 1977	December 31, 1978
Bennett, Charles E.	D	FL	3 rd	January 19, 1977	January 2, 1979
Hamilton, Lee H.	D	IN	9 th	January 19, 1977	January 2, 1979
Preyer, L. Richardson	D	NC	6 th	January 19, 1977	January 2, 1979
Flowers, Walter	D	AL	7 th	January 19, 1977	January 2, 1979
Spence, Floyd D.	R	SC	2 nd	January 19, 1977	January 2, 1979
Quillen, James H.	R	TN	1 st	January 19, 1977	January 2, 1979
Quie, Albert H.	R	MN	1 st	January 19, 1977	January 2, 1979
Cochran, Thad	R	MS	4 th	January 19, 1977	December 26, 1978
Fenwick, Millicent H.	R	NJ	5 th	January 19, 1977	January 2, 1979
Caputo, Bruce F.	R	NY	23 rd	January 26, 1977	January 2, 1979

Member	Party	State	District	Began Assignment	Ended Assignment
96th Congress (1979-1981)					
Bennett, Charles E.	D	FL	3 rd	January 31, 1979	January 2, 1981
Hamilton, Lee H.	D	IN	9 th	January 31, 1979	January 2, 1981
Preyer, L. Richardson	D	NC	6 th	January 31, 1979	January 2, 1981
Slack, John M. Jr.	D	WV	3 rd	January 31, 1979	March 17, 1980
Murphy, Morgan F.	D	IL	2 nd	January 31, 1979	December 20, 1979
Murtha, John P. Jr.	D	PA	12 th	January 31, 1979	January 2, 1981
Spence, Floyd D.	R	SC	2 nd	January 24, 1979	January 2, 1981
Hollenbeck, Harold C.	R	NJ	9 th	January 24, 1979	January 2, 1981
Livingston, Robert L.	R	LA	1 st	January 24, 1979	January 2, 1981
Thomas, William M.	R	CA	18 th	January 24, 1979	January 2, 1981
Sensenbrenner, F. Jas Jr.	R	WI	9 th	January 24, 1979	January 2, 1981
Cheney, Richard B.	R	WY	AL ^a	January 31, 1979	January 2, 1981
Stokes, Louis	D	OH	21 st	February 6, 1980	January 2, 1981
Rahall, Nick J. II	D	WV	4 th	March 26, 1980	January 2, 1981
97th Congress (1981-1983)					
Stokes, Louis	D	OH	21 st	January 28, 1981	January 2, 1983
Rahall, Nick J. II	D	WV	4 th	January 28, 1981	January 2, 1983
Alexander, William V. Jr.	D	AR	1 st	January 28, 1981	January 2, 1983
Wilson, Charles	D	TX	2 nd	January 28, 1981	January 2, 1983
Holland, Kenneth L.	D	SC	5 th	January 28, 1981	January 2, 1983
Bailey, Donald A.	D	PA	21 st	January 28, 1981	January 2, 1983
Spence, Floyd	R	SC	2 nd	January 28, 1981	January 2, 1983
Conable, Barber B. Jr.	R	NY	35 th	January 28, 1981	January 2, 1983
Myers, John T.	R	IN	7 th	January 28, 1981	January 2, 1983
Forsythe, Edwin B.	R	NJ	6 th	January 28, 1981	January 2, 1983
Brown, Hank	R	CO	4 th	January 28, 1981	January 2, 1983
Hansen, James V.	R	UT	1 st	January 28, 1981	January 2, 1983

Member	Party	State	District	Began Assignment	Ended Assignment
98th Congress (1983-1985)					
Stokes, Louis	D	OH	21 st	January 6, 1983	January 2, 1985
Rahall, Nick J. II	D	WV	4 th	January 6, 1983	January 2, 1985
Jenkins, Edgar L.	D	GA	9 th	January 6, 1983	January 2, 1985
Dixon, Julian C.	D	CA	28 th	January 6, 1983	January 2, 1985
Fazio, Victor H.	D	CA	4 th	January 6, 1983	January 2, 1985
Coyne, William J.	D	PA	14 th	January 6, 1983	January 2, 1985
Spence, Floyd	R	SC	2 nd	January 6, 1983	January 2, 1985
Conable, Barber B. Jr.	R	NY	30 th	January 6, 1983	January 2, 1985
Myers, John T.	R	IN	7 th	January 6, 1983	January 2, 1985
Forsythe, Edwin B.	R	NJ	13 th	January 6, 1983	March 29, 1984
Brown, Hank	R	CO	4 th	January 6, 1983	January 2, 1985
Hansen, James V.	R	UT	1 st	January 6, 1983	January 2, 1985
Bliley, Thomas J. Jr.	R	VA	3 rd	May 9, 1984	January 2, 1985
99th Congress (1985-1987)					
Dixon, Julian C.	D	CA	28 th	January 7, 1985	January 2, 1987
Jenkins, Edgar L.	D	GA	9 th	January 30, 1985	January 2, 1987
Fazio, Victor H.	D	CA	4 th	January 30, 1985	January 2, 1987
Coyne, William J.	D	PA	14 th	January 30, 1985	January 2, 1987
Dwyer, Bernard J.	D	NJ	6 th	January 30, 1985	January 2, 1987
Mollohan, Alan B.	D	WV	1 st	January 30, 1985	January 2, 1987
Spence, Floyd	R	SC	2 nd	January 30, 1985	January 2, 1987
Myers, John T.	R	IN	7 th	January 30, 1985	January 2, 1987
Hansen, James V.	R	UT	1 st	January 30, 1985	January 2, 1987
Whitehurst, G. William	R	VA	2 nd	January 30, 1985	January 2, 1987
Pursell, Carl D.	R	MI	2 nd	January 30, 1985	January 2, 1987
Wortley, George	R	NY	27 th	January 30, 1985	January 2, 1987

Member	Party	State	District	Began Assignment	Ended Assignment
100th Congress (1987-1989)					
Dixon, Julian C.	D	CA	28 th	February 19, 1987	January 2, 1989
Fazio, Victor H.	D	CA	4 th	February 19, 1987	January 2, 1989
Dwyer, Bernard J.	D	NJ	6 th	February 19, 1987	January 2, 1989
Mollohan, Alan B.	D	WV	1 st	February 19, 1987	January 2, 1989
Gaydos, Joseph M.	D	PA	20 th	February 19, 1987	January 2, 1989
Atkins, Chester G.	D	MA	5 th	February 19, 1987	January 2, 1989
Spence, Floyd	R	SC	2 nd	January 21, 1987	June 1, 1988
Myers, John T.	R	IN	7 th	January 21, 1987	January 2, 1989
Hansen, James V.	R	UT	1 st	January 21, 1987	January 2, 1989
Pashayan, Charles S. Jr.	R	CA	17 th	January 21, 1987	January 2, 1989
Petri, Thomas E.	R	WI	6 th	January 21, 1987	January 2, 1989
Craig, Larry E.	R	ID	1 st	January 21, 1987	January 2, 1989
Brown, Hank	R	CO	4 th	June 2, 1988	January 2, 1989
101st Congress (1989-1991)					
Dixon, Julian C.	D	CA	29 th	January 3, 1989	January 2, 1991
Fazio, Victor H.	D	CA	4 th	January 3, 1989	January 2, 1991
Dwyer, Bernard J.	D	CA	29 th	January 3, 1989	January 2, 1991
Mollohan, Alan B.	D	NJ	6 th	January 3, 1989	January 2, 1991
Gaydos, Joseph M.	D	WV	1 st	January 3, 1989	January 2, 1991
Atkins, Chester G.	D	PA	20 th	January 3, 1989	January 2, 1991
Stokes, Louis ^b	D	OH	21 st	September 13, 1989	July 26, 1990
Myers, John T.	R	IN	7 th	January 3, 1989	January 2, 1991
Hansen, James V.	R	UT	1 st	January 3, 1989	January 2, 1991
Pashayan, Charles S. Jr.	R	CA	17 th	January 3, 1989	January 2, 1991
Petri, Thomas E.	R	WI	6 th	January 3, 1989	January 2, 1991
Craig, Larry E.	R	ID	1 st	January 3, 1989	January 2, 1991
Grandy, Fred	R	IA	6 th	January 3, 1989	January 2, 1991

Member	Party	State	District	Began Assignment	Ended Assignment
102nd Congress (1991-1993)					
Stokes, Louis	D	OH	21 st	February 6, 1991	January 2, 1993
Ackerman, Gary L.	D	NY	7 th	February 6, 1991	July 4, 1992
Darden, George (Buddy)	D	GA	7 th	February 6, 1991	July 4, 1992
Cardin, Benjamin L.	D	MD	3 rd	February 6, 1991	January 2, 1993
Pelosi, Nancy	D	CA	5 th	February 6, 1991	January 2, 1993
McDermott, Jim	D	WA	7 th	February 6, 1991	January 2, 1993
Mfume, Kweisi ^c	D	MD	7 th	October 9, 1991	January 2, 1993
Hansen, James V.	R	UT	1 st	February 6, 1991	January 2, 1993
Grandy, Fred	R	IA	6 th	February 6, 1991	January 2, 1993
Johnson, Nancy	R	CT	6 th	February 6, 1991	January 2, 1993
Bunning, Jim	R	KY	4 th	February 6, 1991	January 2, 1993
Kyl, Jon L.	R	AZ	4 th	February 6, 1991	January 2, 1993
Goss, Porter J.	R	FL	13 th	February 6, 1991	January 2, 1993
Hobson, David L.	R	OH	7 th	February 6, 1991	January 2, 1993
103rd Congress (1993-1995)					
McDermott, Jim	D	WA	7 th	February 4, 1993	January 2, 1995
Darden, George (Buddy)	D	GA	7 th	February 4, 1993	January 2, 1995
Cardin, Benjamin L.	D	MD	3 rd	February 4, 1993	January 2, 1995
Nancy, Pelosi	D	CA	5 th	February 4, 1993	January 2, 1995
Mfume, Kweisi	D	MD	7 th	February 4, 1993	January 2, 1995
Borski, Robert A.	D	PA	3 rd	February 4, 1993	January 2, 1995
Sawyer, Thomas C.	D	OH	14 th	February 4, 1993	January 2, 1995
Grandy, Fred	R	IA	6 th	January 5, 1993	January 2, 1995
Johnson, Nancy L.	R	CT	6 th	January 5, 1993	January 2, 1995
Bunning, Jim	R	KY	4 th	January 5, 1993	January 2, 1995
Kyl, Jon L.	R	AZ	4 th	January 5, 1993	January 2, 1995
Goss, Porter J.	R	FL	13 th	January 5, 1993	January 2, 1995
Hobson, David L.	R	OH	7 th	January 5, 1993	January 2, 1995

Member	Party	State	District	Began Assignment	Ended Assignment
Schiff, Steven	R	NY	1 st	February 4, 1993	January 2, 1995
104th Congress (1995-1997)^d					
Johnson, Nancy L.	R	CT	6 th	January 20, 1995	January 21, 1997
Bunning, Jim	R	KY	4 th	January 20, 1995	January 9, 1997
Goss, Porter J.	R	FL	13 th	January 20, 1995	January 21, 1997
Hobson, David L.	R	OH	7 th	January 20, 1995	January 15, 1997
Schiff, Steven	R	NM	1 st	January 20, 1995	January 21, 1997
Smith, Lamar S. ^e	R	TX	21 st	January 9, 1997	January 21, 1997
McDermott, Jim ^f	D	WA	7 th	January 20, 1995	January 14, 1997
Cardin, Benjamin L.	D	MD	3 rd	January 20, 1995	January 21, 1997
Pelosi, Nancy	D	CA	5 th	January 20, 1995	January 21, 1997
Borski, Robert A.	D	PA	3 rd	January 20, 1995	January 21, 1997
Sawyer, Thomas C.	D	OH	14 th	January 20, 1995	January 21, 1997
105th Congress (1997-1999)					
Hansen, James V.	R	UT	1 st	January 9, 1997	January 2, 1999
Smith, Lamar S.	R	TX	21 st	September 29, 1997	January 2, 1999
Hefley, Joel	R	CO	5 th	September 29, 1997	January 2, 1999
Goodlatte, Robert	R	VA	6 th	September 29, 1997	January 2, 1999
Knollenberg, Joe	R	MI	11 th	September 29, 1997	January 2, 1999
Berman, Howard L.	D	CA	26 th	February 10, 1997	January 2, 1999
Sabo, Martin O.	D	MN	5 th	September 29, 1997	January 2, 1999
Pastor, Ed	D	AZ	2 nd	September 29, 1997	January 2, 1999
Fattah, Chaka	D	PA	2 nd	September 29, 1997	January 2, 1999
Lofgren, Zoe	D	CA	16 th	September 29, 1997	January 2, 1999
106th Congress (1999-2001)					
Smith, Lamar S.	R	TX	21 st	January 6, 1999	January 2, 2001
Hefley, Joel	R	CO	5 th	January 19, 1999	January 2, 2001
Knollenberg, Joe	R	MI	11 th	January 19, 1999	January 2, 2001
Portman, Robert J.	R	OH	2 nd	January 19, 1999	January 2, 2001

Member	Party	State	District	Began Assignment	Ended Assignment
Camp, Dave	R	MI	4 th	January 19, 1999	January 2, 2001
Berman, Howard L.	D	CA	26 th	January 6, 1999	January 2, 2001
Sabo, Martin O.	D	MN	5 th	January 6, 1999	January 2, 2001
Pastor, Ed	D	AZ	2 nd	January 6, 1999	January 2, 2001
Fattah, Chaka	D	PA	2 nd	January 6, 1999	January 2, 2001
Lofgren, Zoe	D	CA	16 th	January 6, 1999	January 2, 2001
107th Congress (2001-2003)					
Hefley, Joel	R	CO	5 th	January 20, 2001	January 2, 2003
Portman, Robert J.	R	OH	2 nd	March 6, 2001	July 11, 2001
Hastings, Doc	R	WA	4 th	March 6, 2001	January 2, 2003
Hutchison, Asa	R	AR	3 rd	March 6, 2001	August 6, 2001
Biggert, Judy	R	IL	13 th	March 6, 2001	January 2, 2003
Hulshof, Kenny	R	MO	9 th	July 11, 2001	January 2, 2003
LaTourette, Steve	R	OH	19 th	October 10, 2001	January 2, 2003
Berman, Howard	D	CA	26 th	January 20, 2001	January 2, 2003
Sabo, Martin	D	MN	5 th	March 6, 2001	August 1, 2001
Pastor, Ed	D	AZ	2 nd	March 6, 2001	January 2, 2003
Lofgren, Zoe	D	CA	16 th	March 6, 2001	January 2, 2003
Jones, Stephanie Tubbs	D	OH	11 th	March 14, 2001	January 2, 2003
Green, Gene	D	TX	29 th	July 11, 2001	January 2, 2003
108th Congress (2003-2005)					
Hefley, Joel	R	CO	5 th	January 8, 2003	January 2, 2005
Hastings, Doc	R	WA	4 th	February 11, 2003	January 2, 2005
Biggert, Judy	R	IL	13 th	February 11, 2003	January 2, 2005
Hulshof, Kenny	R	MO	9 th	February 11, 2003	January 2, 2005
LaTourette, Steve	R	OH	19 th	February 11, 2003	January 2, 2005
Berman, Howard	D	CA	26 th	January 8, 2003	February 26, 2003
Mollohan, Alan B.	D	WV	1 st	February 5, 2003	January 2, 2005
Jones, Stephanie Tubbs	D	OH	11 th	March 6, 2003	January 2, 2005

Member	Party	State	District	Began Assignment	Ended Assignment
Green, Gene	D	TX	29 th	March 6, 2003	January 2, 2005
Roybal-Allard, Lucille	D	CA	34 th	March 6, 2003	January 2, 2005
Doyle, Michael F.	D	PA	14 th	March 6, 2003	January 2, 2005
109th Congress (2005-2007)					
Hastings, Doc	R	WA	4 th	February 2, 2005	January 2, 2007
Biggert, Judy	R	IL	13 th	February 2, 2005	January 2, 2007
Smith, Lamar	R	TX	21 st	February 2, 2005	January 2, 2007
Hart, Melissa	R	TX	4 th	February 2, 2005	January 2, 2007
Cole, Tom	R	OK	4 th	February 2, 2005	January 2, 2007
Mollohan, Alan B.	D	WV	1 st	January 26, 2005	April 25, 2006
Berman, Howard ^g	D	CA	28 th	April 26, 2006	January 2, 2007
Jones, Stephanie Tubbs	D	OH	11 th	February 9, 2005	January 2, 2007
Green, Gene	D	TX	29 th	February 9, 2005	January 2, 2007
Roybal-Allard, Lucille	D	CA	34 th	February 9, 2005	January 2, 2007
Doyle, Michael F.	D	PA	14 th	February 9, 2005	January 2, 2007
110th Congress (2007-2009)					
Jones, Stephanie Tubbs ^h	D	OH	11 th	January 4, 2007	August 20, 2008
Green, Gene ^h	D	TX	29 th	February 8, 2007	-
Roybal-Allard, Lucille	D	CA	34 th	February 8, 2007	-
Doyle, Michael F.	D	PA	14 th	February 8, 2007	-
Delahunt, William D.	D	MA	10 th	February 8, 2008	-
Scott, Robert C. "Bobby"	D	VA	3 rd	September 11, 2008	-
Hastings, Doc	R	WA	4 th	January 4, 2007	-
Bonner, Jo	R	AL	1 st	February 12, 2007	-
Barrett, J. Gresham	R	SC	3 rd	February 12, 2007	-
Kline, John	R	MN	2 nd	February 12, 2007	-
McCaul, Michael T.	R	TX	10 th	February 12, 2007	-

a. Representative At Large, i.e. the state's only Member of the House.

b. Appointed to serve in place of Representative Chester Atkins.

c. Appointed to serve in place of Representative Louis Stokes, and appointed to replace Representative Gary L. Ackerman in the 102nd Congress on August 11, 1992.

- d. Most of the Members of the Committee from the 104th Congress were appointed to the Select Committee on Ethics in the 105th Congress, which existed from January 7, 1997, to January 21, 1997. This select committee was established to resolve the Statement of Alleged Violations issued in the 104th Congress by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct against the Speaker of the House. This select committee expired on January 21, 1997, with the House approving a reprimand against the Speaker.
- e. Appointed to the Select Committee on Ethics to complete the investigation begun by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.
- f. Representative Jim McDermott was briefly replaced on the committee (July 23, 1996-July 24, 1996) by Representative Louis Stokes (D-OH) during a committee inquiry involving Representative McDermott.
- g. Representative Howard Berman was appointed as the ranking member of the committee after Representative Alan Mollohan resigned from the committee.
- h. Representative Stephanie Tubbs Jones died on August 20, 2008, and Representative Gene Green is serving as acting chairman for the remainder of the 110th Congress.