David Skaggs, Chair
Yvonne Burke
Karan English
Allison Hayward

Porter Goss, Co-Chair
Jay Eagen
William Frenzel
Abner Mikva

Leo J. Wise, Staff Director & Chief Counsel

Congress of the United States House of Representatives

OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS (202) 225–9739 (202) 226–0997 (FAX)

Washington, DC 20515

oce.house.gov oce@mail.house.gov Mailing Address: P.O. Box 895 Washington, DC 20515–0895

Office Address: 425 3rd Street, SW Suite 1110 Washington, DC 20024

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

May 27, 2010

Contact: Jon Steinman Jon.Steinman@mail.house.gov

STATEMENT OF THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS REGARDING EVIDENCE COLLECTED IN OCE'S PMA INVESTIGATION:

The Board of the Office of Congressional Ethics has voted unanimously to refer to the United States Department of Justice certain evidence collected in the course of its investigation concerning appropriations earmarks and the now defunct PMA lobbying firm. The evidence pertains to a factual finding by the OCE Board that certain persons and companies saw their campaign donations as affecting decisions about earmarks. The Board released this information to the Department of Justice pursuant to Section 1(f)(B) of House Resolution 895 of the 110th Congress and Rule 13 of the OCE Rules for the Conduct of Investigations.

The Board made the referral to the Department of Justice at this time after the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct apparently completed its review of the evidence (evidence previously provided to the Standards Committee by OCE) and the Chair and Ranking Member of the Committee issued a statement in response to H. Res. 1193, H. Res. 1220, H. Res. 1225 and H. Res. 1287.

After that statement was issued, Representatives Jeff Flake of Arizona and Paul Hodes of New Hampshire requested that the OCE to release the evidence it had collected in its PMA investigation. The OCE Board is committed, consistent with the limits prescribed by House Resolution 895, to keep Members and the public informed about its work. However, under the circumstances of this case and the risk of prejudice to any pending criminal investigation, among other concerns, the Board was unable to grant their request.