

CRS Report for Congress

Received through the CRS Web

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

Updated July 14, 2004

Mildred Amer
Specialist in American National Government
Government and Finance Division

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. Since that time, it has undergone two major reorganizations, first in 1989, and again 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 sanction, including expulsion of a Member.

The majority of the committee's work, however, is advisory and done by its Office of Advice and Education, which was 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 periodic educational briefings on standards of conduct rules and laws, and responds to requests for advisory opinions and interpretations of applicable laws, rules, and statutes.

In addition, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct 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, and the Ethics Reform Act of 1989.

The first announced disciplinary case considered by the committee was in 1975. Since then, the committee has taken some form of public action on cases involving some 60 other Representatives, including two Speakers of the House. The results have ranged from public acknowledgment from the Committee on Standards (or in some cases Members of the House) that it had considered, but dismissed, a complaint against a Member, to the noting of infractions not meriting sanctions, to the issuance of a "Letter of Reproval," to the recommendation of censure, reprimand, or expulsion by the House. Eighteen Members have left the House after court convictions were returned, after Ethics Committee inquiries were initiated, or after charges were brought by the committee, but before House action could be completed. Departure from the House ended their cases because the committee does not have jurisdiction over former Members.

Contents

Introduction	1
Evolution and Background	2
Jurisdiction	5
Changes in Jurisdiction	6
Changes in Procedures	8
Disciplinary Cases	11

List of Tables

Table 1. Congressional Committee Assignments House Standards of Official Conduct Committee	14
---	----

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 on April 13, 1967, by the 90th Congress. It has been designated by the House of Representatives to meet the key elements of its responsibility for self-discipline 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 Behavior, and, with the concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member.”

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.¹ After several stages in an investigative process, the committee may recommend to the House any appropriate sanction, including the expulsion of a Member.²

The majority of its 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). 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 conducts periodic

¹ The size of the committee was reduced from 14 to 10 on Sept. 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 Congress, the committee was not organized until Sept. 1997 because of a comprehensive review of its procedures by special task force. On Jan. 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 Jan. 21, 1997. See Rep. Richard, Arme y, “Rules of the House,” *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 142, Jan. 7, 1997, pp. H9-H10.

² See “Dear Colleague” letter posted on the committee website at [http://www.house.gov/ethics/m_Committee_Work_DC_letter_3-04.htm], visited July 6, 2004. This letter discusses each of the committee’s responsibilities.

educational briefings on relevant standards of conduct and responds to requests for advisory opinions and interpretations of applicable laws, rules, and statutes.³

In addition, 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), and the Ethics Reform Act of 1989 (P.L. 101-194).⁴

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.⁵ 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.⁶ 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.

³ Useful information about the committee's activities and advisory opinions can be found on its website at [<http://www.house.gov/ethics>].

⁴ 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 appendices in this *Manual* contain the text of selected House rules covering the committee's jurisdiction and procedure as well as the rules, regulations, and statutes relating to standards of conduct applicable to House Members, officers, and employees. The most recent manual was published in 1992, U.S. Congress, House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, *Ethics Manual for Members, Officers, and Employees of the U.S. House of Representatives*, 102nd Cong., 2nd sess. (Washington: GPO, 1992), 493p. For the most recent information on House rules of conduct, visit the Standard Committee's website at [<http://www.house.gov/ethics>].

⁵ 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.

⁶ The Committee on House Administration still investigates contested and other congressional election cases, as did its predecessor.

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). In its final report, the Joint Committee called for the creation of a Committee on Standards and Conduct in the House.⁷

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, the House created the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct (H.Res. 1013).⁸

As reported, H.Res. 1013 granted the select committee powers similar to those ultimately given the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.⁹ However, the resolution was amended on the floor, 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."¹⁰ 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 standing committee to be known as the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.¹¹

⁷ 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.

⁸ *Congressional Record*, vol. 112, Oct. 19, 1966, pp. 27713-27730.

⁹ 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), 1 p.

¹⁰ 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), 10p.

¹¹ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Rules, *Establishment of a Standing Committee to be* (continued...)

H.Res. 418, which was adopted on April 13, 1967, established a 12-member, bipartisan Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.¹² 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 1967.¹³ 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.¹⁴

Pursuant to this report, the House Rules Committee reported H.Res. 1099, which contained many of these recommendations.¹⁵ That resolution was amended and adopted by the House on April 3, 1968.¹⁶ 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

¹¹ (...continued)

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), 1p.

¹² *Congressional Record*, vol. 113, April 13, 1967, pp. 9426-9448.

¹³ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, *Standards of Official Conduct*, hearings, 90th Cong., 1st sess., Aug. 16-17, 23-24, 1967, and Sept. 14, 21, 27, 1967 (Washington: GPO, 1967), 310p.

¹⁴ 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), 45p.

¹⁵ 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), 1p.

¹⁶ *Congressional Record*, vol. 114, April 3, 1968, pp. 8776-8812.

House Code of Official Conduct (Rule XLIII); and (4) the first financial disclosure requirements for Members, officers, and designated employees (Rule XLIV).¹⁷

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;¹⁸ 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 also imposed several limitations on the Ethics Committee. These requirements, except where noted, are still in effect in House Rule X, clause 4(e). 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;¹⁹
- 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 individual to no fewer than three Members who have refused in writing to transmit the complaint to the committee;²⁰

¹⁷ Only a portion of the disclosures required by this two-part rule was to be available to the public.

¹⁸ With the adoption of H.Res. 168 (105th Cong., 1st sess.) on Sept. 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.

¹⁹ 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.

²⁰ H.Res. 168, adopted Sept. 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
(continued...)”

- investigations of alleged violations of any law, rule, etc., that was not in effect at the time of the alleged violation are prohibited;²¹ and
- members of the committee are not eligible to participate in any committee proceeding relating to their official conduct.²²

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.²³ 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.²⁴ With the adoption of the House rules for the 95th Congress (1977-1979), jurisdiction²⁵ 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.²⁶

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.²⁷ 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 conduct and was authorized to maintain the public financial disclosure reports filed by Members, officers, and designated employees.²⁸ In addition, a Select Committee

²⁰ (...continued)

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.”

²¹ 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.

²² Provisions were made for the Speaker to replace the Member for the duration of any such case. In 1977, the House rules were amended to provide also 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.

²³ *Congressional Record*, vol. 116, July 8, 1970, pp. 23136-23141.

²⁴ *Congressional Record*, vol. 121, Jan. 14, 1975, p. 20.

²⁵ *Congressional Record*, vol. 123, Mar. 9, 1977, pp. 6811-6817.

²⁶ *Congressional Record*, vol. 123, Jan. 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).

²⁷ *Congressional Record*, vol. 123, Mar. 2, 1977, pp. 5885-5953.

²⁸ In 1989, the office of the Clerk of the House became the repository for House public (continued...)

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 to the House on any substantiated allegations.²⁹

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.³⁰ 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.³¹ 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.

On November 16, 1995, the House passed H.Res. 250 and adopted a new rule banning most gifts to Members, officers, and employees.³² On the opening day of the 106th Congress, the House amended its gift rule (Rule XXVI) to conform to the Senate gift rule which has been in effect since 1996.³³ The amended rule allows

²⁸ (...continued)
financial disclosure reports.

²⁹ *Congressional Record*, vol. 123, July 14, 1977, pp. 22932-22949.

³⁰ *Congressional Record*, vol. 125, Jan. 15, 1979, p. 9.

³¹ The Ethics Reform Act, which passed the House on Nov. 16, 1989, and was signed into law (P.L. 101-194) on Nov. 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, Nov. 16, 1989, pp. 29469-29509.

³² *Congressional Record*, vol. 141, Nov. 16, 1995, pp. 33419-33441.

³³ Rep. James Hansen, “House Gift Rule Amendment,” *Congressional Record*, daily edition, (continued...)

Members, officers, and employees of the House to accept any gift of \$50 or less in a calendar year or a gift with a cumulative value of \$100 from any one source in a calendar year. Gifts of \$10 or less do not count towards the \$100 annual limit.

All provisions of the gift rule are interpreted and enforced by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, which is authorized to issue guidance on any matter contained in the rule.

Changes in Procedures

Since the creation of the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in 1967, major changes in its composition and rules of procedure have occurred, in 1989 and 1997.³⁴

On September 18, 1997, after some seven months of study, the House adopted, with amendments, the recommendations of the Ethics Reform Task Force, which had been established in February 1997.³⁵ The 10-member task force was mandated to review the existing House ethics process and recommend reforms of that process.³⁶ It was chaired by Representative Bob Livingston (R-LA) and Representative 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.”³⁷ 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.

³³ (...continued)

vol. 145, Jan. 6, 1999, pp. H208-H211.

³⁴ 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.

³⁵ “Implementing the Recommendations of Bipartisan House Ethics Task Force,” *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 143, Sept. 18, 1997, pp. H7544-H7573.

³⁶ *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 143, Feb. 12, 1997, pp. H456-H457.

³⁷ *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 143, Feb. 12, 1997, p. H456.

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

- changing the way non-Members 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;³⁸
- 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 might be established by the committee;³⁹
- requiring the chairman and ranking member of the committee to determine within 14 calendar days or five legislative days, whichever ever comes first, if the information offered as a complaint meets the committee's requirements;⁴⁰
- allowing an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members of the committee or approval of the full House to refer evidence of law violations disclosed in a committee investigation to the appropriate state or federal law enforcement authorities;⁴¹
- providing for a nonpartisan, professional Ethics Committee staff;
- allowing the ranking member to have an equal opportunity to place matters on the committee's agenda;
- decreasing the maximum service on the committee from six years to four years during any three successive Congresses; and
- requiring at least four members to be rotated off the committee at the end of each Congress.

These changes took effect in the 105th Congress. Moreover, after the members of the committee were appointed for the 105th Congress in September 1997, they

³⁸ This procedure replaces the requirement that non-Members could file complaints with the Ethics 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.

³⁹ The first pool of 20 Members selected to serve on investigative committees of the Standards Committee was appointed on Nov. 13, 1997. See The Speaker Pro Tempore [Rep. Ray La Hood], "List of Republican and Democratic Members Selected to Serve As Pool Members For Purposed Relating To The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct," *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 143, Nov. 13, 1997, p. H10947-H10948. The House leadership has appointed a 20-person pool of Members in each Congress since then.

⁴⁰ Previously, there was no specific time limit for this determination.

⁴¹ With the exception of a brief period in 1966, previously only a vote by the full House permitted referrals of possible violations of law to the appropriate authorities.

voted to carry over three pending cases from the 104th Congress and apply the new procedures to each of those cases.

When the House adopted its rules for the 106th Congress, it voted to eliminate the rule requiring four members of the Standards Committee to rotate off the committee every Congress. The House also 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.)⁴²

Prior to 1997, the most far-reaching changes in the committee's responsibilities and procedures followed the adoption of the Ethics Reform Act of 1989.⁴³ That act established the Office of Advice and Education, effective January 1, 1990. This office is part of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, but separate from its enforcement functions. Its staff provides guidance and 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:

- “bifurcation” (separation) within the committee of its investigative and adjudicative functions;⁴⁴
- a requirement that the committee report to the House on any case it has voted to investigate and that any Letter of Reproval 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; and
- 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.

The act also increased the size of the committee's membership from 12 to 14 and implemented a time limit of committee service (no more than three out of any five consecutive Congresses). However, these changes were superseded by the new reforms in 1997.

Other 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

⁴² *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 145, Jan. 6, 1999, p. H14.

⁴³ *Congressional Record*, vol. 135, Nov. 16, 1989, pp. 29469-29509.

⁴⁴ Bifurcation has thus far been implemented in six committee investigations.

opinions, and investigations;⁴⁵ (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;⁴⁶ 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.⁴⁷

Disciplinary Cases⁴⁸

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, and prohibit members and staff from disclosing 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.⁴⁹

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 Reproval” without recommending action by the full House, or recommend one or more sanctions if it determines a rules violation has occurred.⁵⁰

The sanctions that may be recommended include expulsion, censure, or reprimand; 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

⁴⁵ *Congressional Record*, vol. 120, Oct. 8, 1974, p. 34470.

⁴⁶ *Congressional Record*, vol. 123, Jan. 4, 1977, p. 53.

⁴⁷ *Congressional Record*, vol. 125, Jan. 15, 1979, p. 8.

⁴⁸ A historical summary of all House ethics cases is available upon request from the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, Room HT-2, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC 20515 (202-225-7103).

⁴⁹ 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.

⁵⁰ A public Letter of Reproval is a sanction created by the committee and first used in 1987. 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 Reproval or other committee administrative action may only be issued as a final report to the House. The committee has issued five public “Letters of Reproval.”

Ethics Committee.⁵¹ Typically, the House has supported the committee's recommendations, although it is not required to do so. In two instances, the House has changed a reprimand to a censure and in once instance, a censure to a reprimand.

Since its inception, published accounts have indicated that the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has taken some form of action on cases involving some 61 Representatives, including two Speakers of the House.⁵² 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 recommendation of censure or expulsion of a Member.⁵³ Four Members of the House have been censured, and two expelled following investigations by the committee.

The first announced disciplinary case considered by the committee was in 1975. After completing its inquiry on this matter in 1976, the committee 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 10 Members. Eighteen Members of the House have left 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 addition, in the 98th Congress, the committee conducted an investigation of alleged improper alterations of House documents. In the 99th Congress, it conducted an 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

⁵¹ 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.

⁵² This number is an approximation 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.

⁵³ See CRS Report RL30764, *History of Congressional Ethics Enforcement*, by Mildred Amer.

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	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
Hebert, 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	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
Hebert, 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	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
Hebert, 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
Hebert, 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	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 ^a	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 ^b	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)^c					
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. ^d	R	TX	21 st	January 9, 1997	January 21, 1997
McDermott, Jim ^e	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
Fatta, Chaka	D	PA	2 nd	September 29, 1997	January 2, 1999
Lofgen, 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, Rob	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
Fatta, Chaka	D	PA	2 nd	January 6, 1999	January 2, 2001
Lofgen, 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, Rob	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
Lofgen, 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	-
Hastings, Doc	R	WA	4 th	February 11, 2003	-
Hastings, Doc	R	WA	4 th	February 11, 2003	-
Hulshof, Kenny	R	MO	9 th	February 11, 2003	-
LaTourette, Steve	R	OH	19 th	February 11, 2003	-
Berman, Howard	D	CA	26 th	January 8, 2003	February 26, 2003
Mollohan, Alan B.	D	WV	1 st	February 5, 2003	-
Jones, Stephanie Tubbs	D	OH	11 th	March 6, 2003	-

Member	Party	State	District	Began Assignment	Ended Assignment
Green, Gene	D	TX	29 th	March 6, 2003	-
Roybal-Allard, Lucille	D	CA	34 th	March 6, 2003	-
Doyle, Michael F.	D	PA	14 th	March 6, 2003	-

- a. Appointed to serve in place of Representative Atkins.
- b. Appointed to serve in place of Representative Stokes, and appointed to replace Representative Ackerman in the 102nd Congress on Aug. 11, 1992.
- c. 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 Jan. 7, 1997, to Jan. 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 Jan. 21, 1997, with the House approving a reprimand against the Speaker.
- d. Appointed to the Select Committee on Ethics to complete the investigation begun by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.
- e. Representative 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.