

THE HONORABLE JEFF FLAKE
Noticing a Privilege Resolution

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I hereby notify the House of my intention to offer a resolution as a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of my resolution is as follows:

- Whereas, *The Hill* reported that a prominent lobbying firm, founded by Mr. Paul Magliocchetti and the subject of a “federal investigation into potentially corrupt political contributions,” has given \$3.4 million in political donations to no less than 284 members of Congress. (*The Hill*, March 4, 2009)
- Whereas, the *New York Times* noted that Mr. Magliocchetti “set up shop at the busy intersection between political fund-raising and taxpayer spending, directing tens of millions of dollars in contributions to lawmakers while steering hundreds of millions of dollars in earmarks contracts back to his clients.” (*The New York Times*, March 30, 2009).
- Whereas, a guest columnist recently highlighted in *Roll Call* that “...what [the firm’s] example reveals most clearly is the potentially corrupting link between campaign contributions and earmarks. Even the most ardent earmarkers should want to avoid the appearance of such a pay-to-play system.” (*Roll Call*, March 30, 2009)
- Whereas, multiple press reports have noted questions related to campaign contributions made by or on behalf of the firm; including questions related to “straw man” contributions, the reimbursement of employees for political giving, pressure on clients to give, a suspicious pattern of giving, and the timing of donations relative to legislative activity.
- Whereas, *Roll Call* has taken note of the timing of contributions from employees the firm and its clients when it reported that they “have provided thousands of dollars worth of campaign contributions to key Members in close proximity to legislative activity, such as the deadline for earmark request letters or passage of a spending bill.” (*Roll Call*, March 3, 2009)
- Whereas, the Associated Press highlighted the “huge amounts of political

donations” from the firm and its clients to select members and noted that “those political donations have followed a distinct pattern: The giving is especially heavy in March, which is prime time for submitting written earmark requests.” (*Associated Press*, March 23, 2009)

- Whereas, clients of the firm received at least three hundred million dollars worth of earmarks in fiscal year 2009 appropriations legislation, including several that were approved even after news of the FBI raid of the firm’s offices and Justice Department investigation into the firm was well known.
- Whereas, after a cursory review, the fiscal year 2010 defense appropriations earmark list recently made available includes at least seventy earmarks worth hundreds of millions of dollars for former PMA clients.
- Whereas, the Associated Press reported that “the FBI says the investigation is continuing, highlighting the close ties between special-interest spending provisions known as earmarks and the raising of campaign cash.” (*Associated Press*, March 23, 2009)
- Whereas, the persistent media attention focused on questions about the nature and timing of campaign contributions related to the firm, as well as reports of the Justice Department conducting research on earmarks and campaign contributions, raise concern about the integrity of Congressional proceedings and the dignity of the institution.
- Now, therefore, be it: *Resolved*, that the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall immediately establish an investigative subcommittee and begin an investigation into the relationship between the source and timing of past campaign contributions to Members of the House related to the raided firm and earmark requests made by Members of the House on behalf of clients of the raided firm.