

lations with, three congressmen, and that he arranged male prostitutes for a Senator and two other government employees. Williams also repeated to interviewers other allegations of sexual misconduct by Members and employees of the House which Williams claimed other pages had told him.

On August 26, 1982, Williams was reinterviewed by investigators from the Special Counsel's office, who had spent days documenting many inconsistencies and contradictions in Williams' allegations. Williams admitted to them that he had lied. On Saturday, August 28, 1982, he testified under oath at a deposition before the Chairman and Special Counsel of this Committee that none of the statements he had made about sexual misconduct were true. In subsequent testimony and interviews with the Special Counsel's staff, he also admitted that he did not believe most of the second hand information he had passed on.

The Special Counsel has concluded that there is no evidence to support any of Williams' original charges. In reaching this conclusion, the Special Counsel has not relied solely on Williams' recantation. Rather, the Special Counsel has conducted a detailed investigation of each one of William's allegations. Every bit of independent evidence collected supports the conclusion that Williams' original allegations were false and that he was telling the truth when he testified that he had lied about those charges.

F. Jeffrey Opp

Jeffrey Opp was the second page who appeared, with his identity concealed, on the June 30 CBS News Broadcast. Opp served as a page from January 4, 1982 until June 12, 1982. During the time he was a page, Opp went out of his way to challenge authority and to make people aware of his extreme political views. Not surprisingly, there was substantial tension between Opp and his supervisors in the Doorkeeper's office. He was known as a crusader, "someone who believed his goal in life was to change the system." Pages said Opp had a tendency to "blow things way out of proportion." The impressions of the staff who worked for Congresswoman Schroeder reinforce the view that Opp was prone to exaggeration. One staffer who had provided temporary housing to Opp for his first month in Washington said Opp had a "super-hyper imagination".

Opp's own behavior reflects this tendency. The day after meeting with the television reporter, Opp told two persons on the staff of his congressional sponsor that he had worked undercover for CBS for two weeks, helping investigate Congressmen involved with male prostitutes. Opp claimed that his apartment had been bugged, and that his roommate was a spy from the Doorkeeper's office. As he later testified, none of these statements were true.

In Opp's broadcast interview, he alluded to "homosexual approaches" that Congressmen had made to him. In interviews with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and this Committee in June and July, Opp described four specific incidents which he described as homosexual approaches. He also reported other allegations of sexual misconduct based on hearsay information.

The Special Counsel has found no evidence to support any of these allegations.

The personal experiences that Opp reported with three Members of Congress and one lobbyist were little more than conversations, each less than two minutes, occurring in public places and involving no improper actions.

Opp's perspective has changed on most of his June allegations. In September, he told one of his friends among the pages that most of his stories had been inspired by the television news reporter who had sought him out three months before. Opp testified at his deposition that his TV interview "was a 16 year old kid satisfying his ego."

Based on a review of Opp's testimony and information provided by others, the Special Counsel has found him to be a highly impressionable teenager, with a tendency to place interpretations on events that appear to have no rational connection to what actually occurred. The Special Counsel found no basis whatsoever to conclude that anything improper occurred in any of the four conversations cited by him as the basis for his allegations about his personal experiences.

The second-hand information provided by Opp has also proved to be unsubstantiated. Much of it was nothing more than teenage gossip. None of it was accurate.

A careful evaluation of information provided by Opp has yielded not a single piece of responsible evidence that improper actions occurred. All the evidence the Special Counsel has developed—including significant changes in Opp's own story—indicates that there is no support for his allegations.

G. Other allegations

During the course of the investigation pursuant to House Resolution 518, the Special Counsel has received a number of allegations of improper or illegal sexual conduct by Members, officers, or employees of the House of Representatives. In some cases investigations are continuing. But the Special Counsel has concluded his investigation of most of the allegations received. Part V-D of this report summarizes the allegations investigated where no evidence was found to support further investigation. No further investigation will be pursued where the allegations concerned persons no longer associated with the House of Representatives.

H. February 1982 page investigation by U.S. Capitol Police

The United States Capitol Police (USCP) conducted a brief investigation into allegations of misconduct involving pages in early February, 1982. The Committee decided that the February investigation should be reviewed to determine whether the Capitol Police had information relevant to the Committee's investigation pursuant to House Resolution 518.

The Special Counsel has reviewed the written records of the USCP investigation, and has interviewed or deposed the following individuals: the Capitol Police detective who carried out the investigation and his superiors; individuals in the offices of the Doorkeeper and the Sergeant-at-Arms; Members of the House and their staffs who received information about the investigation; and pages who were interviewed by the USCP.

Based on the evidence obtained in the course of this investigation, the Special Counsel has found that the Capitol Police investigation was based on allegations of misconduct by pages, and that at no time in the course of the investigation did the police receive any significant allegations of misconduct by anyone else. The Special Counsel has concluded the decision to terminate the investigation was reasonable from the point of view of the Capitol Police.

But there was a serious failure on the part of the House as an institution. The Capitol Police developed information about page misbehavior that required further action. Yet no one took the action that was plainly required—because no one is charged with responsibility for supervising the teenage pages after working hours.

Based on the evidence received in the course of this investigation, the Special Counsel believes that there is an urgent need for the House of Representatives to fix responsibility—formally and in writing—for the supervision of pages after working hours. In the Special Counsel's judgment, the lack of clear responsibility led directly to the failure to address the serious problems of misconduct that developed among the pages in 1981 and 1982. If the House chooses to employ teenage high school pages, establishing a page dormitory and a Page Board are steps in the right direction. But unless responsibility for supervision of teenage pages after working hours is clearly established, the problems that developed in 1981-82 are likely to recur.

II. SCOPE OF INVESTIGATION INVOLVING SEXUAL MISCONDUCT

A. *Language and legislative history of House Resolution 518*

The Special Counsel has taken the language and legislative history of H. Res. 518 as the guide in determining the proper scope of the investigation involving sexual misconduct.

Section 1 of H. Res. 518 directs the Committee to investigate "alleged improper conduct [1] referred to in this resolution [2] which has been the subject of recent investigations by the Department of Justice and other law enforcement agencies. . . ."

The conduct "referred to in this resolution" is the conduct described in the "Whereas" clause of the resolution, specifically,

(1) alleged improper or illegal sexual conduct of Members, officers, or employees of the House;
 . . . and

(3) the offering of preferential treatment by Members, officers, or employees to employees of the House, including congressional pages, in exchange for any item referred to in subclause (1). . .

The discussion of H. Res. 518 on the House floor on July 13, 1982, leaves no doubt that the "alleged improper or illegal sexual conduct" and the "offering of preferential treatment" referred to conduct involving pages.

The resolution was introduced by Chairman Louis Stokes and Ranking Minority Member Floyd Spence on July 13, 1982, in the aftermath of reports of sexual misconduct involving pages. Chairman Stokes explained that, on July 1, he had instructed the staff of

the Committee "to commence a thorough investigation of the allegations as reported by the media at that time." 128 Cong. Rec. H4012 (daily ed. July 13, 1982). He urged passage of the resolution to enable the Committee to "proceed in an orderly fashion in pursuing this investigation." Id.

Representative William Alexander, who spoke in favor of the resolution, referred to "allegations of scandal . . . levied against the Members of Congress as well as the pages who assist them." Id. at H4035. He then quoted from a letter he had received from a former page, stressing the page's hope that "the Congress will take speedy action to restore the honor, dignity, and pride that pages enjoy who have served in the Congress." Id.

Representative Margaret Heckler, who urged the appointment of a special prosecutor to investigate the allegations, stated:

We are dealing here with entirely new and far more sensitive areas of abuse of power if the allegations are true. I think we have a responsibility *to the young people who are the pages*, to our service in this Congress, and to the people of America, to the parents, to the Congress itself, to deal with the sensitivity of this situation so as to inspire confidence in the integrity of this Congress. Id. at H4036 (emphasis added).

The resolution's reference to conduct "which has been the subject of recent investigations by the Department of Justice and other law enforcement agencies" reinforces the conclusion that the sexual misconduct to be investigated involves congressional pages. In the area of sexual misconduct, the "recent investigation" by the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation concerned allegations about misconduct of House Members and employees involving pages. In addition, the United States Capitol Police had conducted an investigation in February, 1982, which also focused specifically on House pages.

The intended meaning of H. Res. 518 appears clear. The references to "alleged improper or illegal sexual conduct" and the "offering of preferential treatment" are directed at sexual misconduct involving pages. The first phase of the Special Counsel's investigation has, therefore, addressed this subject.

This phase of the investigation focused on the period from July, 1981, to June, 1982,² and on allegations made by two former pages that received national press attention beginning on June 30, 1982. To insure a thorough inquiry into all matters within the scope of H. Res. 518, the Special Counsel sought out information about earlier periods. In addition, to the extent that the Special Counsel received information about alleged sexual misconduct by House Members, officers or employees involving preferential treatment that did not involve congressional pages, but fell within the literal terms of H. Res. 518, the Special Counsel also investigated such allegations.

² This time period covers the terms of service of virtually all the pages whose employment overlapped with that of the two pages whose allegations were reported in news broadcasts on June 30, 1982 and July 1, 1982.

Finally, H. Res. 518 refers to "Members, officers, or employees" of the House. In keeping with this language and the jurisdiction of the Committee, the scope of the investigation has not extended to allegations concerning former Members, officers, or employees.

B. Definition of sexual misconduct

In recognition of the special situation of congressional pages, the Committee and its Special Counsel have broadly defined "improper sexual conduct" in determining whether particular allegations involving pages should be investigated.

House pages are generally high school juniors and seniors, between 16 and 18 years of age. By statute, they cannot be appointed until their parents or legal guardians have been fully informed of the nature of their work, pay and working conditions, and the housing accommodations available to them.³

Congress plainly accepts a considerable responsibility for pages.⁴ That responsibility is necessarily shared by every Member, officer and employee of the House. Where preferential treatment is, expressly or implicitly, an element of a sexual relationship between a Member, officer or employee and a page, or an element of a sexual overture or advance directed at a page, the conduct explicitly falls within H. Res. 518. But considering the young age of these pages and the fact that they are away from home and dependent on the House for school, work and money to live on, any sexual advance or relationship of any kind involving a page and a Member, officer or employee potentially entails an element of either preferential treatment or coercion, and hence an abuse of office or position.

The investigation has, therefore, proceeded on the assumption that any sexual relationship, whether homosexual or heterosexual, between a page and a Member, officer or employee, or any sexual harassment, overture or advance directed at a page by a Member, officer or employee, should be investigated as potentially "improper sexual conduct" under H. Res. 518.

C. Allegations involving the Senate

In some instances, the Special Counsel has received information bearing on Members, officers, or employees of the Senate. The Special Counsel has not investigated these matters because the jurisdiction of the Committee runs only to the House. At the direction of the Committee and in accordance with arrangements with Senate Majority Leader Howard Baker, the Special Counsel has referred all such information to the Select Committee on Ethics of the U.S. Senate.

³ 2 U.S.C. § 88b-1(a)(2).

⁴ On a number of occasions the House has considered discontinuing the use of high school teenagers as pages. For example the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, Public Law 91-510, 84 Stat. 1198 (1970), as originally introduced, would have barred the appointment of pages who had not yet completed the twelfth grade of their secondary school education, 116 Congressional Record 32,229 (1970). Among the reasons commonly offered for using older pages is the desirability of minimizing or eliminating Congress's supervisory responsibility for pages. See e.g., Speaker's Commission on Pages, report to the Speaker, 97th Congress, 2d Session 7 (1982); H. Rept. 91-1215, 91st Congress 2d Session 29-30 (1970).

III. HOW THE INVESTIGATION WAS CONDUCTED

A. Appointment of the Special Counsel and staffing of the Special Counsel's Office

Shortly after Chairman Stokes and Ranking Minority Member Spence announced the appointment of Joseph A. Califano, Jr. as Special Counsel to the Committee to oversee the investigation authorized by H. Res. 518, Mr. Califano assembled the staff of the Special Counsel's office. In staffing the office, as throughout the investigation, the pledges of independence were unequivocally supported by the Democratic and Republican House leadership.

Mr. Califano appointed Richard Cotton as Deputy Special Counsel, Hamilton P. Fox, III, as Associate Special Counsel, and Gerald McQueen as Chief Investigator. Mr. Cotton, a partner in Mr. Califano's law firm, had just completed a six-month internal investigation for an international labor union. Mr. Fox had served as a federal prosecutor for six and a half years, as an Assistant U.S. Attorney, Deputy Chief of the Justice Department's organized crime section, and a member of the Watergate Special Prosecution Force. Mr. McQueen, a New York City homicide detective with 23 years' experience, had won national recognition as the commander of an elite detective squad assigned to solve Manhattan's most difficult homicide cases.

The staff of the Special Counsel's office has averaged nine lawyers, seven investigators, three researchers and six clerical employees.

B. Characteristics of the investigation.

Since July 27, 1982, the Special Council's office has attempted to investigate every specific allegation⁵ that has come to its attention concerning the subject matter of H. Res. 518. In addition, the office has mounted wide-ranging efforts to contact individuals who might have information bearing on the subject matter of the investigation.

Attorneys and investigators on the Special Counsel's staff have carefully examined and followed up hundreds of leads, allegations and rumors. They have interviewed more than 150 individuals, many more than once, and conducted more than 50 depositions. They have travelled some 40,000 miles to interview witnesses in 40 cities. Forty-five subpoenas have been issued: 31 to compel oral testimony, 14 to compel production of documents. In addition, the office has made numerous requests to such agencies as the FBI, the United States Capitol Police and the Metropolitan Police and to the broadcast media for materials which were voluntarily produced. Where necessary to follow up on specific allegations, investigators have reviewed financial and telephone records.

While it was essential to investigate each one of the specific allegations that prompted the passage of H. Res. 518, the Special Counsel decided that the mandate of H. Res. 518 required the Committee to seek out information that might bear on the subject matter of the investigation from all available sources. The Special Counsel

⁵ Some allegations concerned events so far in the past or were so vague that investigation was not practicable.

initiated a number of separate inquiries to carry out this obligation.

First, lawyers and investigators interviewed more than 75 pages who had recently served in the House, and personnel in the Doorkeeper's office whose duties include supervision or direction of pages.

Second, the Special Counsel sent a letter requesting any information bearing on the subject matter under investigation to each of 516 former pages who had not already been contacted in person. These individuals served in the House of Representatives from September, 1979, through August, 1982. The text of this letter is reproduced in Appendix B to this report. Eighty-nine pages responded; 71 responded in writing, an additional 18 by telephone. Most said they had no information, but 11 responses contained relevant information or allegations of misconduct that required further investigation.

Third, the Special Counsel requested and obtained from the Capitol Police all documents and records for the years 1977 through 1982 that contained information bearing on the subject matter under investigation.

Fourth, the Special Counsel made similar requests of the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, whose office is in charge of the page system, and of the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives, who, together with the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate and the Architect of the Capitol, directs the Capitol Police.

Fifth, lawyers and investigators interviewed current and former teachers at the Capitol Page School concerning their knowledge of the subjects under investigation. Investigators also reviewed files of individual pages at the Capitol Page School and interviewed teachers from other educational institutions who had had contact with pages in seminars and special classes.

Sixth, the Special Counsel's office examined a comprehensive compilation of press reports on the subject matter of H. Res. 518 and viewed videotapes of television news reports to identify specific allegations that merited investigation.

C. Relationship with the Department of Justice

From June through August, 1982, the Department of Justice investigated allegations of sexual misconduct by Members of Congress and their staff. On August 31, 1982, the Department announced that it had closed that investigation because, as a Department spokesman stated, "there is insufficient evidence to warrant a Federal prosecution or further investigation."

On behalf of the Committee, the Special Counsel requested that the Attorney General make available to the Committee and its Special Counsel all written materials developed by the FBI in carrying out this investigation. On September 29, 1982, the Public Integrity Section of the Justice Department transmitted to the Special Counsel 244 documents, consisting primarily of summaries of interviews carried out by FBI agents in the course of this investigation. The names of certain witnesses who had requested confidentiality were deleted. The Justice Department informed the Committee that, with this exception, it had provided all the evidence collected.

D. Limits on the investigation

Any investigation of "improper or illegal sexual conduct" poses difficult obstacles and delicate problems. The Special Counsel's office has had to depend in large measure on interviews and depositions under oath to investigate these matters. Developing evidence depends on the willingness of individuals to come forward and to respond honestly to investigator's questions.

The investigation that has been conducted has, in the judgment of the Special Counsel, been as thorough as is reasonably possible. In an area involving such intimate conduct, such human sensitivity and so many individuals, it will never be possible to declare with certainty that every instance of what every citizen would consider "improper sexual conduct" has been detected. But the Committee, the House and the American people can be assured that every effort was made to contact individuals who might have relevant information. Every allegation put forward has been and will be pursued to the point where the Special Counsel concludes that there is no basis for it in fact, or that a preliminary inquiry is justified.

This has not been an inexpensive or pleasant task. It has taken much time, persistence, and patience on the part of Members of this Committee and attorneys and investigators in the Special Counsel's office, and the support of bipartisan House leadership and the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. For many young Americans, a good number still teenagers, this investigation has been a difficult experience. But it has taken this kind of inquiry to provide the American people the assurance that the House of Representatives has the institutional stamina and courage to investigate its Members, officers, and employees searchingly and thoroughly.

IV. BACKGROUND: THE PAGE SYSTEM OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Because this investigation focused on pages and their relationships with Members, officers and employees of the House, it is essential to begin with an understanding of the page system. The House has relied on teenage pages as messengers since the early 1800's, and the system has survived many debates about its desirability, including the most recent review conducted this past summer by the Speaker's Commission on Pages. The key features of the page system—the selection process, the duties of pages, and the extent to which they are supervised—are described briefly below.

A. Selection process and qualifications

During 1981-82, the House maintained 71 positions for House pages. Most page appointments run for six months or a year, although some appointments—typically in the summer—are for periods of two months or less.

Pages are nominated by a House Member and selected by the Democratic and Republican Personnel Committees from the candidates nominated. At the time of appointment, they must be high school juniors or seniors, at least 16 but not more than 18 years of age. The Republican Personnel Committee requires that pages have

had at least a "B" scholastic average in their home town high school; the Democratic Committee requires at least a "C" average.

Any Democratic Member of Congress may submit a recommendation to the Committee on Democratic Personnel requesting that an individual be appointed as a Democratic page. Typically, these recommendations provide the Committee with some information about the candidate, but the Committee has no application form and requires no specific information other than a birth certificate. The nominations are not considered on any particular date. The Committee's staff accumulates nominations until approximately ten are pending. These nominations, ranked according to the seniority of the Member making the nomination, are then submitted to the Committee Chairman, who makes the selections. The Committee conducts no independent check of a page's qualifications. The sponsoring Member is responsible for screening applicants and establishing that they meet the age, school year, and academic criteria.

The Committee on Republican Personnel has a printed application form, which requires a school transcript, an essay on why the applicant wants to be a page, a statement of extracurricular activities, and letters of recommendation. The Committee also requests that the Member personally interview the applicant and requires that sponsoring Members return the application materials by April 1 of each year. Information on each candidate is summarized by the Committee's staff, and page selection is made by Committee vote. In selecting pages, the Committee gives preference to Members who have not previously sponsored a page.

Neither Committee has established a systematic process for assessing the maturity of page candidates or their ability to handle the freedom that pages enjoy in Washington.

B. Duties of House pages

Pages do not work for the individual Members of Congress who sponsor them. They receive direction from the staff of the Doorkeeper of the House, and work out of a central location just off the House floor.

Pages never become involved in the substantive give-and-take of the legislative process. Their duties are exclusively those of clerical workers and messengers. They are generally assigned to the House floor, to the Democratic or Republican Cloakroom, or to positions as "running" pages. A page assigned to the House floor carries messages to and from Members and assists in assembling and distributing legislative materials on the floor. A page assigned to the Democratic or Republican Cloakroom answers telephones, carries messages to Members, and performs chores requested by Members while they are in the Cloakroom. "Running" pages deliver materials to congressional offices and to Members on the floor. Several pages serve as documentarians, processing House documents and operating the system of bells that call Members for votes. One is assigned as the Speaker's page.

The daily schedule of all pages, regardless of their assignment, is demanding. All are required to attend the Capitol Page School. Those enrolled for credit must maintain a "C" average; the rest are required to bring assignments from their home school and observe supervised study hours. Classes at the Capitol Page School begin at

6:10 a.m. and, on days when the House convenes at noon, typically run until 9:45 a.m. or 10:30 a.m. When the House convenes earlier, class sessions are abbreviated so that pages can report to work at least an hour before the House starts. Except for meals, the pages remain on duty until 5:00 p.m. or until the House adjourns for the day, whichever is later.

C. Supervision of pages

(1) Working hours

The Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, who is elected by the Caucus of the Majority Party, is responsible for supervising House pages during their working hours. The four to six pages working in the Democratic Cloakroom and the similar number working in the Republican Cloakroom report to the respective Managers of the Cloakrooms. The Democratic and Republican floor pages report, respectively, to the Majority and Minority Chief Pages, who are adult supervisors employed by the Doorkeeper of the House. The "running" pages, who are also supervised by the Majority and Minority Chief Pages, have intermediate supervisors drawn from the ranks of the pages themselves. These page "overseers" answer the telephones to receive requests for messenger service and then make assignments to "running" pages.

While the Doorkeeper of the House has overall responsibility for the pages, the Deputy Doorkeeper exercises disciplinary authority and receives reports from the two Cloakroom Managers and the two Chief Pages.

(2) Nonworking hours

Outside of working hours, no one has responsibility for supervision. In fact, the Handbook issued by the Doorkeeper specifically asserts that it is a condition of appointment that:

Parents or Guardians must file with the Doorkeeper of the House, a written statement assuming full responsibility for the safety, well-being, and supervision of the Appointee while living in the District of Columbia area and traveling to and from the House of Representatives.

No individual in the Doorkeeper's office is formally responsible for counseling pages on problems outside of work or for seeing that they stay out of trouble. Some individuals in the Doorkeeper's Office show a good deal of concern for the pages' well-being, especially when it becomes apparent that a page is in some kind of difficulty.

The salary of teenage House pages—approximately \$700 every month—represents far more money than most of them have previously had to manage.

Pages are responsible for finding their own housing. In 1981-82, pages generally resided in groups ranging from two to six in apartments located at various places on Capitol Hill, or in housing obtained through a university housing service. Apartments are frequently passed on from one page to another. Pages living in apartments had, in general, no adult supervision and no one easily available in the event of trouble.

Approximately 25 female pages lived in Thompson-Markward Hall, referred to by the pages as the "Y" because it is a dormitory-like facility with relatively strict curfew and other rules. The Page House Alumni Association, a non-profit organization created through the efforts of an employee of the Doorkeeper's office, provided dormitory-style housing for about ten male pages until August of last year.

Committee investigators interviewed the managers of seven apartment buildings in which pages resided. These individuals had been renting to pages for periods of time that range from slightly over one year to 40 years. Most were complimentary about the conduct of the pages, and reported no knowledge of serious alcohol, drug or other problems with pages who had been their tenants. One, however, complained about excessive drinking and loud and boisterous parties.

The lack of effective supervision of pages after working hours has been sharply criticized for many years. Members of Congress have frequently called attention to the problem. In 1969, for example, Representative Andrews of North Dakota noted:

It is unconscionable for Congress to bring these boys to the Washington metropolitan area and put them in some catch-as-catch-can accommodations where they lack supervision and decent quarters. If we are going to have high school boys working for the Congress they should have adequate quarters and proper supervision." Hearings before the Legislative Branch Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. 497 (1969).

In 1970, Representative Green of Oregon stated:

It is inconceivable to me that this situation has been allowed to continue. * * * We bring youngsters—oftentimes from rural areas—turn them loose in a metropolitan area with more money than they have ever before had in their pockets and with absolutely no supervision in off hours. * * * [I]t is incumbent upon us to provide these facilities in terms of housing and also in terms of classrooms. They find their own rooms in rooming houses or in tourist homes. I repeat—they have no supervision at all in their spare time. There is absolutely no one who is looking after their nutrition, their meals. 116 Cong. Rec. 32278 (1970).

Testifying this past summer before the House Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations, the Doorkeeper of the House stated:

They [the pages] are wards of the Congress. Once we bring them here, we have to assume some responsibility. We have already had some incidents. * * * It is a very serious problem. Hearings on Legislative Branch Appropriations before Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations of the House Committee on Appropriations, 97th Cong., 2nd Sess., pt. 2 at 49 (1982).

Because of concern over the absence of effective supervision, Congress has on a number of occasions considered discontinuing the use of high school age pages.

V. RESULTS OF INVESTIGATION

The publicity given to the allegations made by Williams and Opp gave new life to every rumor and piece of gossip any page had ever heard. Once the House commissioned an investigation of sexual misconduct involving pages, any allegation repeated seriously by a page had to be investigated. Investigators have reconstructed conversations and rumors that were born in a milieu of teenage gossip and braggidocio. Investigators have time after time tracked a story from one page to another and finally to its source. In most instances, these allegations have proved without foundation—the result of a teenager trying to sound experienced, or the result of a drunken story invented on the spur of the moment at a party. Hundreds of hours of investigation have been required to reach these conclusions, and the results are set out below.

Not all of the allegations of sexual misconduct received by the Special Counsel have yet been fully investigated, however. In one case, the Special Counsel has recommended that a Preliminary Inquiry be initiated by the Committee, and the investigation of this case is continuing. The Special Counsel also continues to investigate a limited number of other allegations of sexual misconduct. No details will be provided at this time on any of the matters still under investigation.

This section discusses, first, the origins of the rumors about a "page scandal," and the events leading up to the charges made by Williams and Opp. The second and third parts of this section then examine in detail the allegations made by Williams and Opp, the investigation of these allegations, and the basis for the findings and conclusions reached by the Committee's Special Counsel.

Finally, the fourth part of this section briefly reviews a variety of other allegations of sexual misconduct received by the Special Counsel and his findings and conclusions concerning them

A. *The origin of the allegations*

(1) *The 1981-82 year: The extent of alcohol use, drug use, and other misbehavior among pages*

(a) *Overview.*—The Committee's investigation has found evidence of serious misbehavior by at least some of the pages during non-working hours over the 1981-82 year. These problems mirror those found elsewhere in the nation—alcohol abuse, drug abuse, late-night parties—but they were intensified by the complete freedom teenage pages enjoyed and the lack of any supervision after work.

Information provided to the Special Counsel indicates that many House pages routinely drank alcoholic beverages during the 1981-82 year, and many got drunk at large parties that occurred almost weekly. A lesser but still significant number of pages drank excessively at smaller gatherings that occurred two or three times a week. A small number of pages also used drugs—caffeine pills, marijuana, and, in at least some instances, cocaine. Some pages used amyl nitrate, an over-the-counter substance inhaled through

the nose. Information obtained by the Special Counsel indicates that alcohol abuse was far more prevalent than the use of other drugs. For example, pages often described the extent of marijuana use to Committee investigators as no more, and some said it was less, than they had witnessed at their home high schools.

Individual experience differed markedly. Pages tended to form small cliques, and a page's experience outside of work depended on his or her clique. The information provided to the Special Counsel suggests that the pages fell roughly into three groups. One group, generally those who lived in the supervised housing, abstained almost entirely from use of alcohol and other drugs. A second group, the largest numerically, tended to follow a middle path: They consumed alcoholic beverages (primarily beer) on occasion, and some in this group, particularly at parties, did drink to excess. This group experimented little with drugs. Finally, a third group—pages who lived in apartments and who saw themselves as more "mature" and independent—had the least disciplined life style. They attended more parties, drank a great deal, and were far more likely to use drugs.

(b) Alcohol abuse by pages.—The major drug problem that the pages themselves perceived was alcohol. Virtually every page interviewed on the subject stated that alcohol was easily available to underage pages from certain restaurants, bars, and liquor stores in the Capitol Hill areas of Washington.

The Special Counsel received information that pages generally consumed alcohol in three different circumstances: at lunchtime, at small informal gatherings at night, or at larger parties given by and attended by pages.

Pages generally ate lunch in the government cafeterias on Capitol Hill. On occasion, however, pages would journey a few blocks to several restaurants on Pennsylvania Avenue and elsewhere in the area of the Capitol. The Special Counsel received varied testimony and information as to how frequently pages went to restaurants at lunch time. One page testified that some pages went out often and would frequently get drunk at lunchtime. Another testified that one page had been sent home after lunch for being drunk. Two pages testified that they ate at the Pennsylvania Avenue restaurants a maximum of three to four times during the year, drank beer, but never got intoxicated. Another page discounted the stories of drinking at lunch as teenage boasting.

Pages engaged in different activities after working hours. Some reported that they had little social life; they simply returned to their living quarters, ate dinner, did homework, and went to bed early, because they had to arise at five a.m. each weekday. Others led more active social lives. For example, a group of five or six pages—of whom Leroy Williams was one—would gather at one another's rooms two or three evenings a week. At such gatherings, beer was the standard drink and hard liquor was often available. These gatherings sometimes became all-night sessions—with pages "passing out," sleeping in their clothes until it was time to go to class.

During the 1981-82 year, pages also attended a number of larger parties. Estimates on the frequency of these parties have ranged from once a week to once a month. The variations in these esti-

mates can be attributed to the frequency with which individual pages heard of or attended parties, and to differences in defining what constituted a "party," as distinguished from a more informal get-together. Nonetheless, large parties apparently occurred with some frequency. Alcoholic beverages were available at these parties, including hard liquor as well as beer. A good deal of drinking took place at these parties, and it was not uncommon for pages to become intoxicated.

For example, one page testified that at "every party that I attended" alcohol was consumed, and that pages got drunk at "most" page parties the page had attended. Two other pages testified about parties at which they might have had so much to drink that they could not remember conversations or events that took place at the party. Another testified the pattern changed during the course of the year:

I think pages abused that privilege of being on their own, so they drank when they first got there. But after the first few months some maintained drinking but some just dropped it and thought it was ridiculous, a waste of time, you know, do it every now and then. But the way they first came, it was like every single night, school nights and everything.

Several parties stood out in the minds of individual pages because of specific events. Pages recalled one party where a fight broke out between a page and two non-pages; another where Leroy Williams was so drunk he fell and cut himself badly; one where a female page developed a nose bleed as a result of inhaling something; a fourth which was a "going-away" party for Leroy Williams; a year-end party where both alcohol and marijuana were available to pages.

In summary, alcohol use was extensive among pages during the 1981-82 year, and among some groups of pages and individuals it was seriously out of hand.

(c) *Drug abuse by pages.*—The Special Council has not completed the investigation of allegations concerning illicit use or distribution of drugs by Members, officers, or employees of the House. This report does not set forth any specific findings concerning such use or distribution. But it would be incomplete and misleading to address the sexual allegations involving pages without providing as background a description of the general sense obtained to date of drug use among the pages during 1981-82. Since these matters are still the subject of an active investigation by the Special Counsel and the Department of Justice, the summary presented here must necessarily be both partial and general.

The information gathered by the Special Counsel to date indicates that there was drug use by some pages during 1981-82. This drug use fell into four categories:

First, some pages used high dosage caffeine pills, amphetamines, or diet pills normally available only by prescription. Often these pills were used to keep awake during school and working hours.

Second, some pages used amly nitrate, a substance known colloquially by a variety of names: "poppers," "rush," or "locker room." This substance comes in hard capsules which are broken open to allow the substance to be sniffed and gives the user a "rush." It is reputedly used to enhance sexual performance. This substance is available over the counter.

Third, some pages smoked marijuana. The information obtained to date is not sufficient to determine the extent of marijuana used among the pages. But pages have said that it was used occasionally by some pages and that marijuana was smoked by a few pages at parties.

Fourth, the evidence received to date indicates that four pages may have used cocaine on a few occasions, although there is conflicting evidence on whether all four used it and, if so, how often. The information obtained to date is also not sufficient to reach a firm conclusion at this time about the extent of cocaine use among pages.

The evidence the Special Counsel has received, therefore, indicates that illegal drugs were used by some pages during 1981-82. No use of drugs by teenagers can be viewed as anything other than a grave and serious matter. But the evidence received to date indicates that the majority of pages did not use drugs during 1981-82.

(2) Events of January to June, 1982

(a) Leroy Williams' departure from Washington, D.C.—The departure of Leroy Williams from Washington, D.C. is the event that brought attention to the activities of some pages. Williams had arrived as a page in June, 1981. He had been promoted to the position of page overseer in July, 1981. To all outward appearances he was doing well throughout the Fall of 1981. To the other pages, Williams appeared to have a lot of money, dressed well, and moved with a group of pages that partied and drank a lot.

On Friday, January 29, 1982, Williams turned his books in to the Secretary of the Capitol Page School. That night there was a farewell party for him. He left Washington that weekend.

Williams' departure might have been both the beginning and the end of the story were it not for Williams' landlady. She had been in regular contact with Williams' supervisor in the Doorkeeper's office, seeking assistance in collecting back rent. The Tuesday after Williams' departure, she reported to his supervisor that Williams had left behind some things in his room, including someone else's wallet. The supervisor informed her that the owner of the wallet was a page who had reported her wallet missing from the House Republican Cloakroom about two weeks earlier.

Based on this information, the landlady contacted the Capitol Police.

(b) The Grossi investigation.—When the page's wallet had first been reported missing, the Capitol Police had assigned the matter to Sgt. John Grossi of the Criminal Investigation Division. On February 2, 1982, Williams' landlady met with Grossi and gave him the missing wallet. She informed Grossi that she had found the wallet when she was cleaning out the room of Leroy Williams.

Williams' landlady also told Grossi, that she had information concerning misconduct by pages. Grossi testified that she said that there had been "wild parties" at Williams' apartment and that "quite an amount of liquor and beer had been consumed." She reported receiving many complaints of loud all-night parties and broken liquor bottles in the trash area of the apartment building.

Finally, the landlady told Grossi about "pornographic material" which she found in Williams' room. According to Grossi, she said that she had found "a particular type of magazine that lists homosexuals and . . . how you can get in touch with them."

During the next nine days, from February 2 to February 11, 1982, Grossi investigated not just the page's stolen wallet, but general misconduct of pages, including possible page involvement in homosexual activities.

Grossi interviewed eight pages. Both his recollection and his contemporaneous written reports indicate that the pages he interviewed confirmed that parties had occurred at which pages drank heavily. Grossi pressed for details in his interviews about the use of alcohol and the use of drugs among pages. He questioned the pages about Williams' homosexuality, about homosexuality among other pages, and about sexual activity between pages and "non-page adult." According to Grossi's recollections, he did not ask questions about sexual activity involving either Members of Congress or congressional staff. He testified he had no reason to ask these questions because he had received no information suggesting such involvement. Nonetheless, it appears that at least two of the pages whom he interviewed interpreted his questions to mean that he was asking about Members of Congress and about congressional staff.

Grossi's reports list eight pages as directly or indirectly involved in loud parties, excessive drinking, forays to the Fourteenth Street "red light" district allegedly in search of prostitutes, or use of amyl nitrate. Grossi testified several pages told him that "the problem would no longer be a problem . . . if they just got rid of a certain group that was causing these problems."

In the course of his investigation, Grossi provided his written reports to Benjamin Guthrie, the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House. Guthrie provided information and copies of the reports to James Molloy, Doorkeeper of the House. Molloy in turn discussed these matters with several of his subordinates, at least some of whom also read Grossi's reports.

In a February 11, 1982 meeting, Guthrie directed Grossi to close his investigation.⁶

(c) *Actions following Grossi investigation.*—Based on the information that Grossi developed, three actions occurred:

1. Two pages were terminated—technically on the grounds that they had grades below a C average at the page school.
2. Doorkeeper Molloy informed sponsors of pages mentioned in Grossi's report that their pages' names had come up in the investigation.
3. Certain individual pages were reprimanded, and all pages were cautioned about their personal behavior.

⁶ A further discussion of the Capitol Police investigation appears in Appendix A.

Page terminations: One page reported by Grossi as a source of problems—Williams—had already left Washington. Molloy removed him from the page rolls to reflect administratively what had already occurred in fact.

During the Grossi investigation, Molloy discovered that two of the pages named in Grossi's reports had just then received mid-term grades which fell below a C average. These two pages had come to his attention as poor workers in the past. He decided to terminate these two pages. To avoid giving them a bad record, Molloy justified the termination entirely on the basis of their grades. Molloy's recollection is that he simply informed the sponsoring Members that the pages were being sent home.⁷

Molloy discussed another page identified by Grossi as a troublemaker with the page's immediate supervisor, and with the sponsoring Member. The supervisor reported to Molloy that the page in question was a hard worker and carried out his duties well. Molloy testified that the page's sponsor argued against the page being sent home on a number of grounds. Based on these conversations, Molloy decided not to terminate this page. But he asked the supervisor to have a tough conversation with the page and give him a strong warning that, if any further reports of misbehavior were received, he would be terminated.

Notification to Members: Guthrie and Molloy testified that they had one conversation with the Speaker of the House about the Capitol Police investigation shortly after the investigation began. The Speaker asked Molloy to notify the congressional sponsors of pages whose behaviour was under investigation. Molloy made a round of visits and telephone calls to carry out this instruction. In some circumstances, he could not reach the Member personally, and in some of those instances he provided the information to the Members' staff.

General followup by Doorkeeper's Office: About the middle of February, the Deputy in the Doorkeeper's Office, Jack Russ, convened a meeting of all pages. Russ covered a number of topics at this meeting. He included a strong warning to all pages against bouncing checks, drinking alcohol, or giving or attending wild parties. He alluded to the departure of several pages, with the implication that he hoped that there would be no further problems. Either at this meeting or at other times, pages received the clear impression that the Doorkeeper's Office did not want them to discuss these matters with the press.

(d) *Rumors of a "page scandal" and press followup.*—By mid-February, 1982 many people knew of the Capitol Police investigation and the existence of some page problems. The pages themselves were very much aware of the inquiry. The eight pages whom Grossi interviewed and the several additional pages named in his report were acutely interested in what the Capitol Police were finding. The nature of some of Grossi's questions to the pages inevitably had fueled speculation. Rumors abounded as interviewed pages

⁷ Staff members of the sponsoring Members recall that Molloy mentioned that the pages being dismissed had been named in an investigation. But staff of one of the Congressional sponsors believed that it was the sponsoring Member, and not Molloy, who decided to send the page home on the basis of bad grades. The sponsor of the other page recalls discussing with Molloy several reasons for his page's dismissal, including poor grades.

read additional implications into Grossi's questions and speculated with others on what lay behind those questions. One page testified that another who had been interviewed speculated that Grossi thought Williams was a homosexual liaison for Members of Congress.

Some pages may have had a motivation to spread these rumors. Pages whose conduct was under scrutiny were not happy about the investigation or Molloy's complaints to their sponsors. The Special Counsel received evidence that some pages may, out of anger, have spread, or threatened to spread, malicious stories about Members of the House.⁸ An aide to Representative Patricia Schroeder, who sponsored Opp, recalls that Opp telephoned him one night in February from a page party, and told him that if the pages were going to be criticized they would take a few Members of Congress with them. A congressional staff person called the staff of the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct on February 11 to report the rumor—along with a host of inaccurate details—that Williams had been a homosexual pimp for Members of Congress. When traced to its source by investigators for the Special Counsel, the source turned out to be Opp.

Beyond the pages, some sponsoring Members, the staff of some of those Members, and at least four or five staff members in the Doorkeeper's Office knew not only of the investigation but also of some details. In all, at least 20 to 30 people, probably more, knew something about the problems that had been discovered with the pages. Capitol Hill was described by one witness in his deposition as "the rumor capitol of the world." In this environment, it did not take long for news of the page investigation to travel.

The rumors quickly reached reporters. On February 11, 1982, the very day the Capitol Police closed their investigation, a reporter from the Washington Post called the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and asked if the Committee was investigating improper activity involving House pages. At the same time, a reporter from Independent News Network made a number of calls and sought to interview pages. No stories appeared in the press during February, 1982, but rumors envisioning a scandal far beyond the facts continued to circulate in the Capitol.

(e) Intervening developments.—No further significant developments involving pages occurred during the months of March, April and May.

Two important events did occur, however, although their significance was not appreciated until later. On March 18, 1982, the Arlington Police Department raided a male modeling agency that the police alleged was a front for a homosexual prostitution outcall business. The D.C. and Arlington Police confiscated extensive business records which included the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of hundreds of customers. These records also included detailed accounts of the dates, times, and names of both customer and prostitute for nearly every liaison. At the time of the raid, no

⁸ One of the terminated pages reacted angrily to his termination. This page told other pages that he was going to contact the Washington Post and expose the widespread favoritism on Capitol Hill. This page testified that he never followed through on this threat. But many pages reported as fact to Committee investigators that this page had gone to the House Press Gallery and denounced his sponsor.

one recognized that Friendly Models was the organization whose directory was found in Leroy Williams' room by his landlady in February, 1982.

One month later, on April 19, 1982, in a wholly unrelated investigation, the D.C. Metropolitan Police arrested three individuals for allegedly selling cocaine to an undercover police officer. One of the individuals arrested was a former page, and another was a former congressional staff member. The arrests do not appear to have made news at the time they occurred. But in mid-June both the Washington Post and the local Washington television affiliate of CBS, WDM, ran stories reporting that one of the arrested individuals had begun cooperating with authorities. They charged that a network of Congressional aides such as tour guides, pages, and staff of the House Doorkeeper was distributing drugs on Capitol Hill.

(f) *CBS news reporter*.—Sometime in late May or early June, a CBS television reporter began contacting pages in the House seeking information about improper activities on the part of Members of Congress.⁹ On June 9, 1982, Jeffrey Opp, then a sixteen-year-old House page, received a telephone call at his apartment in Washington, D.C. The caller did not identify himself, but, according to Opp, said he had an invitation for Opp and needed Opp's address. Opp provided his address to the caller. Opp testified that within five minutes a visitor knocked on his door and introduced himself as a CBS news reporter.

According to Opp, the reporter said he had been investigating homosexual activities of Members of Congress for some time. Opp testified under oath that the reporter asked him about a ring of 25 to 50 homosexual Congressmen and about an employee of the Doorkeeper's office who allegedly procured pages for them. Opp testified that the reporter claimed to have talked to homosexual prostitutes who told him that some Members of Congress frequented the "red light" district in Washington. Opp told the FBI and testified in his deposition that the reporter named Congressmen in his discussion of these allegations. According to Opp, the allegations discussed by the reporter were that one Congressman liked eight-year-olds, a second Congressman frequented the homosexual areas of Fourteenth Street, a third was "after little kids," a fourth was involved in homosexual activities, and a fifth was "an avid coke fiend."

According to Opp, the reporter said that he had heard that Opp knew a lot and was not an "air head." By Opp's account, he felt flattered by the reporter's attention and therefore spent some time talking to him.

Immediately after this conversation with the reporter, Opp had conversations with at least two other pages. He talked about homosexual approaches he said he had personally experienced and he also began repeating some of the stories that the reporter had told him.

⁹ The reporter declined to be interviewed by representatives from the Special Counsel's office, so that this account draws on information provided by people to whom the reporter spoke. In addition to the formal exchange of correspondence between the Special Council and the CBS attorney, there were several conversations between the Associate Special Council and the CBS attorney to provide the reporter an opportunity to comment on sworn testimony about him and to obtain any information of improper activities he had.

On June 10, 1982, the day after Opp's discussion with the reporter, Opp went to see two staff aides in the office of Opp's sponsor, Representative Schroeder. He told them about a homosexual prostitution ring and drug use involving pages, Members of Congress and others. They asked him how he knew this, and he said he had been working undercover for the prior two weeks contacting young homosexual prostitutes in a section of New York Avenue (part of the Washington "red light" district) to assist a CBS news investigation. Opp claimed that an electronic "bug" had been placed in his room, that his new roommate was a "plant" placed to spy on him by the House Doorkeeper, and that people were watching his house. According to all three individuals involved, this conversation was tense; Opp was agitated and angry.

The two staff members were concerned about Opp's charges, and angry at the idea that a news organization would use a 16-year-old House page to assist in investigating a homosexual ring in the New York Avenue area. They contacted officials at the Department of Justice, and telephoned the CBS reporter to complain. The reporter said he could not talk on the phone, and arranged to meet them on the Mall in front of the East wing of the National Gallery of Art. The reporter arrived with another CBS employee. The Schroeder aides recall that his manner was very secretive. He said he had learned of a widespread homosexual ring among high-ranking government officials. He said he had been investigating this ring for some time, and it was a major scandal. In a sworn statement, one of the Schroeder aides recalls that at this point in the conversation, the reporter—

Even drew a scheme on a piece of paper which had the Capitol at the center and included lines to the Pentagon, the Department of Justice, State, and GAO. He emphatically asserted that he had solid information that there was a widespread, organized homosexual ring among executive branch employees, including the agencies he drew, [M]embers of [C]ongress, lobbyists, and Capitol employees, and the favors were being traded for sex, including page promotions and extensions.

The Schroeder staff members told the reporter that Opp said he had been used undercover for two weeks on New York Avenue as part of CBS's investigation. The reporter denied that Opp had done any work for him, and said that in fact, he had only talked to Opp the day before, June 9. The reporter said that he had discussed the names of some Congressmen with Opp to get Opp's view of them. The reporter said that he included in the list of names discussed with Opp some "dead-fish" Congressmen whom the reporter did not believe to be involved in improper conduct, in order to test Opp's reliability. Opp had not claimed to have any knowledge about these people, which in the reporter's judgment enhanced the credibility of Opp's comments about others.

Following this meeting with the reporter, the Schroeder aides interviewed Opp again. This interview occurred on Friday, June 11, 1982. Opp admitted that he exaggerated in the first meeting. He admitted that he had made up the story about finding a "bug" as well as the part about interviewing male prostitutes to assist CBS

News. He also admitted he had no evidence that his roommate was a spy, planted by the Doorkeeper's office. But he stuck to the rest of the story.

That same day, the aides made arrangements of Opp to meet with Department of Justice Officials on Monday, June 14, 1982. Also on June 11, however, the reporter called Opp, and Opp agreed to give an interview on camera, with lighting and effects to shield his identity. This interview took place at CBS studios in Washington on the next day, Saturday, June 12, although it was not aired until June 30.

On June 14, 1982, Opp and his father met with attorneys from the Public Integrity Section for two hours. The Justice Department then initiated its investigation.

The CBS reporter later asked one of the Schroeder staff members about the details of the meeting at Justice and requested a description of the agents who attended. That staffer recalls that on at least one occasion between June 10 and June 15, he told the reporter:

If you are basing your story on Opp's word, you are skating on thin ice. He may know something but he is not reliable, and a good deal of what he told us about this, along with some other unrelated items, turned out not to be true. For example, Opp had told me on/about May 1982 he had been admitted to Georgetown University and it turned out he was only a junior in high school and was not admitted to any university.

But Schroeder's staffer said the reporter responded that his story would not be based simply on Opp's allegations, that he had several witnesses and that Opp corroborated what he already had from other sources.

During June, the reporter also contacted Leroy Williams in Arkansas. On Saturday, June 21, 1982, he appeared unannounced at Williams' home in Little Rock. According to Williams' sworn testimony, the reporter said that the Doorkeeper's office had told the press that three pages including him had created problems, these pages had been dismissed, and that action cleared up the problem. The reporter also said to Williams that Opp had told the Justice Department that Williams was involved in homosexual activity as well as in drug trafficking. The reporter said that he believed the Doorkeeper's office was not being fair to Williams and that he wanted to give Williams an opportunity to present his side.

Williams testified that he was upset to hear that the Doorkeeper's office was blaming him for problems of the page system, and that Opp had charged him with trafficking in narcotics. He saw the television reporter as an opportunity to respond to these charges. The reporter assured Williams that he would not reveal his identity, even in discussion with other witnesses information provided by Williams. The reporter promised Williams that he would not reveal the names of any people with whom Williams was sexually involved.

After having been given these assurances of confidentiality, Williams met with the reporter on Sunday, June 22, for about an hour. During that time the reporter interviewed him and tape-recorded

the interview. On the following day, Monday, June 23, Williams, his face backlighted and hidden in deep shadows, gave the reporter an on-camera interview and alleged that he had had homosexual relations with three Congressmen and with Congressional staff.

On June 30 and July 1, CBS broadcast its interviews with Opp and Williams, and the Congress and the nation were introduced to the "page scandal." Thirteen days later, the House adopted to H. Res. 518, initiating this investigation.

(3) Summary

It is the conclusion of the Special Counsel that the rumors that sparked the initial press interest and press investigation of a "page scandal" on Capitol Hill had their origins in the events surrounding the departure of three pages from the page program in late January and early February of 1982.

These events included a brief investigation by Sgt. John Grossi of the Capitol Police Department. The issues raised by this investigation were unquestionably serious. They involved excessive drinking by young pages whose welfare was in large measure the responsibility of the House of Representatives. In addition, there were allegations that pages were involved in the use of drugs and in trips to Fourteenth Street to find prostitutes. Finally, the evidence assembled by Grossi indicated that Leroy Williams had been seriously in debt when he left Washington, and that Williams had left homosexual literature in his room when he left Washington. But nothing in the original investigation or in the facts that the Special Counsel has found concerning events in February even hinted at sexual misconduct involving Members or employees of the House.

Nonetheless, the evidence is clear that rumors about a "page scandal" began circulating in the wake of the investigation. These rumors included stories about sexual relationships between Members and pages as well as stories of pages "pimping" for Members. But the evidence also indicates that these rumors were grossly distorted interpretations of the page dismissals and the Capitol Police investigation.

Finally, the allegations made by the two former pages to the press in June, 1982 appear to have been stimulated more by their own resentment, egos and immaturity, and by contact with one reporter, than by any events involving actions by Members of Congress. It is to the allegations made by Leroy Williams and Jeffrey Opp that we now turn.

B. Leroy Williams

In his CBS interview, Williams asserted that he had had sexual relations with three different Congressmen, three times with one of them, and that he procured homosexual prostitutes for Congressional staffers. Two month's later, Williams changed his story when he was interviewed by Committee investigators. Williams then testified under oath in a deposition taken by the Committee Chairman and Special Counsel that his prior assertions were false.

Since Williams had told two stories that were totally contradictory, the Special Counsel concluded that it was necessary to investigate his charges independently in order to assess whether his origi-

nal story or his recantation was in fact true. In what follows, this report describes Williams' personal background, analyzes his experience in Washington in order to discern his motives for making the false charges that he did, and presents the basis for the Special Counsel's conclusion that Williams' original charges were false and that the testimony he gave under oath when he recanted those charges was accurate.

(1) Personal background

(a) Introduction.—Leroy Williams was born on June 14, 1964 in Little Rock, Arkansas, and is the fifth of six children. His father worked as a laborer until several years ago when a medical disability forced his retirement. His mother is a domestic worker. Williams testified that his two older brothers are in prison, one for murder, one for robbery. His father and mother have periodically separated.

Prior to coming to Washington, Williams attended high school in Little Rock, where he was a "B" student and was involved in extracurricular activities such as the school choir and the drama club. He was also active in the Sixth and Izard Church of Christ. Williams testified that before he came to Washington he drank alcohol infrequently, "maybe once a month." He occasionally used drugs, such as Marijuana, "on a limited social basis," at most once a month.

Unknown to his family and friends in Arkansas, Williams had felt a sexual attraction toward other males since the age of 12. At 14, he engaged in sexual relations with another male for the first time. During the three years from 1978 to 1981 that preceded his arrival in Washington, Williams had sexual relations with men approximately ten times. Williams guarded this secret closely.

Williams first came to Washington in February, 1981, as a participant in "Close-Up," a program that brings high school students to Washington for a week to learn about government. While in Washington, Williams became interested in working as a page and filed an application with his Congressman, Representative Ed Bethune. Williams' application included recommendations from his history teacher and from persons at his church. The House Committee on Republican Personnel notified Congressman Bethune of Williams' selection on May 19, 1981, and he assumed his duties as a page June 29, 1981.

At the end of July, Williams was selected by the Doorkeeper to be one of the two Republican Page Overseers, a supervisory position. Throughout the period Williams served as a page, his work was considered satisfactory, although his performance declined toward the end of his tenure.

It was after working hours that Williams began to have problems. Williams spent most of his time outside of work and school with a group of about five or six pages. He created a fictitious picture that he came from a wealthy family. He told other pages that his father was a heart surgeon, his mother an opera singer. He talked about his parents' ranch, their European travels, and the cotillion balls they held every Christmas. Williams also told the other pages about his girlfriend, Nancy, who he said was a nurse. None of the pages ever saw or met Nancy.

(b) *Sexual activities.*—When the Congress went into its 1981 mid-summer recess, most of the other pages went home. But Leroy Williams remained in Washington alone. He told other pages that he was not going home because his parents were travelling abroad. It was at this point that the 17 year-old Williams first engaged the services of a homosexual prostitute.

He contacted the "Friendly Models" agency and obtained the services of a male prostitute, for which he paid \$50 by check. Williams used the services of the Friendly Models agency on fifteen different occasions between August, 1981, and January, 1982, ten of those times during the August Congressional recess.

In the months that followed, Williams cruised the gay bars and bookstores, and visited a gay bath house. He testified that between the end of August, 1981 and the end of January, 1982 he had homosexual relations on an average of three times a week, usually with a different person whom he had met in one of those establishments. Williams thought some were congressional employees because he said he later recognized them at work in the Capitol. He dealt with these men on a one-time, first-name basis. In addition to these occasional relationships, Williams testified he had sexual relations on a few occasions with a male who was a Government Printing Office employee, and then over a period of several weeks with a male hairdresser who worked in Georgetown. So far as the pages were concerned, Williams tried to hide his homosexuality.

But it was impossible to keep the secret completely hidden. In August, Williams moved to an apartment from the room he had rented when he first arrived. A page supervisor in the Doorkeeper's office, who had rented Williams his first room discovered a brochure advertising the Friendly Models prostitution agency among personal effects Williams had left in his room. This page supervisor has testified under oath that he did nothing with this information:

I figured essentially that Leroy no longer lived there and that his social life, whatever it may be, * * * [was] not of a particular interest to me * * * In any respect, I have not really discussed with any page their sexual activity and while I am concerned about it and don't like it at all, I am not really sure what my role would be in discussing it with them.

(c) *Use of alcohol and drugs.*—During the seven months that Williams was in Washington, he consumed more and more alcohol. He drank when he cruised homosexual bars, and he and the five or six pages in his group drank frequently. The group gathered two or three times a week at his or another page's apartment for heavy drinking sessions lasting well into the night. Sometimes these sessions would go on until it was time for the pages to go to school at six the next morning. Williams or other pages would occasionally drink until they passed out from a combination of alcohol and exhaustion. Williams testified that when he left Washington in late January, 1982, he "was literally an alcoholic."

Williams' use of drugs also increased sharply while he was a page. He frequently took, caffeine pills to stay awake during the long hours of school and work when the House was in session. Williams testified that he used marijuana on several occasions, and he

used cocaine two or three times. But alcohol, not drugs, was his nemesis.

Williams' school record reflects his intensifying problems while he was a page. In early fall 1981, Williams' first advisory grades were close to a B average. By the late fall, they had fallen well below a C average.

(d) Financial problems.—Williams got into increasingly severe financial trouble in Washington. Pages are paid \$700 per month. But that is not enough money to pay for rent, purchase food, and live the kind of lifestyle that Leroy Williams pursued. Williams' use of homosexual prostitutes, his heavy drinking, his expensive taste in clothing, and the gifts he reportedly gave to other pages at Christmas strained his finances severely.

Williams had no source of income other than his salary. He lived in the fashion he did by failing to pay a large number of bills, writing bad checks, and stealing money. When he eventually left Washington in January, 1982, Williams left behind many unpaid charge bills and bounced checks, including almost \$900 in unpaid rent and telephone bills.

(e) Williams' departure.—By January, Williams was regularly bouncing checks. His landlady was becoming more and more impatient for her back rent. Williams testified that he was now more dependent on alcohol, more fearful that his homosexuality had been discovered, and felt more pressured on his job. On Friday, January 29, 1982, Williams told his supervisor he was going to resign. That evening he went out with other pages to a party, and spent the night in a homosexual bath house. The next morning, Saturday, January 30, Williams took an automobile belonging to a fellow page, drove to Tuscaloosa, Alabama. He visited the former youth minister of his church who was living there, and eventually returned home to Little Rock.

(f) Williams' decision to talk to the press.—After he arrived back home in Little Rock in February, 1982, Williams began to realize that his departure had stimulated criticisms and speculation about him.

In early March, Williams was approached by a reporter for a local television station for an interview about his experiences as a page. The reporter asked Williams if he had ever been homosexually propositioned while in Washington. Williams responded, "Just by someone who worked on the Hill."

Then, later in March, the page whose car Williams had taken telephoned and asked if Williams had stolen the automobile which had been recovered in Tuscaloosa, Alabama. Williams denied taking the automobile. The page also told him there were rumors that Williams had been involved in drug trafficking.

According to Williams, he immediately telephoned his best friend among the pages in Washington. She called him back that same evening on a WATS line. She told him that the Doorkeeper's Office had linked him with two other pages who had been dismissed in February. Williams' friend said that supervisors in the Doorkeeper's office were saying that all three pages, including Williams, had been fired because they were "bad apples." She told Williams there was a press investigation about him, and the pages had been told not to talk to the press about Williams.

According to Williams, his anger and resentment came to a head in June 1982, when he gave a CBS News reporter the interview that CBS broadcast on June 30.,

(2) Williams' allegations

The F.B.I., various news organizations, and the Committee's staff interviewed Williams in June and July 1982. He did not tell the same story each time. But, in the course of these interviews, he claimed that:

He was propositioned by, and had sexual relations with, three congressmen;

He arranged a sexual liaison between a Senator and a male prostitute;

He arranged sexual liaisons with male prostitutes for a Congressman's administrative assistant and for an employee of the Government Printing Office.

Williams also repeated to interviewers other allegations of sexual misconduct by Members and employees of the House which Williams said had been told to him by other pages. Specifically, he said he had been told that:

A female page had been sleeping with two different Congressmen;

Pages suspected a Doorkeeper's office employee of procuring female pages for sexual liaisons with a Member of Congress, arranging homosexual activities for Congressmen, and having homosexual relations with some male pages;

The Special Counsel has concluded that there is no evidence to support any of Williams' original charges. In reaching this conclusion, the Special Counsel has not relied solely on Williams' recantations. Rather, the Special Counsel's investigative staff has conducted a detailed investigation of each of Williams' allegations. Every bit of independent evidence collected supports the conclusion that Williams' original allegations were false and that he was telling the truth when he testified he had lied about those charges.

(a) General credibility.—Williams' credibility, even before he said he was lying about all of the allegations, was not high. While in Washington, Williams had lied about his family background. He had written numerous bad checks, failed to pay his rent, and lied to his supervisors about his financial problems. Finally, at the time he left the page program, he was suspected of having stolen both a wallet and a car from other pages.

Williams' Counsel allegations were inconsistent almost from the moment he started making them. In his press interview in March, Williams derided rumors of sexual relations between pages and House staff, saying it was "a very, very small problem." He said he did not know of pages involved with congressional staff members, although he was aware of an occasional "pass" at pages. He specifically denied that he was personally involved in "this homosexual thing," but he did say that once a person "who worked on the Hill" made a "pass" at him.

In June, Williams suddenly made his sensational charges on television that he had sexual relations with three Congressmen and procured prostitutes for congressional staff members. However, in Williams' first interview with the FBI on June 25, 1982, two or

three days after he talked to CBS, Williams mentioned sexual relations with two Congressmen, and did not mention staff. Moreover, the details he provided concerning certain incidents differed. Williams told CBS he had sex with one Congressman on three occasions including one time at the Watergate. Williams told the FBI his most frequent encounters with one Congressman were on two occasions, and never mentioned a tryst at the Watergate.

Williams was reinterviewed by the FBI on July 7, 1982, and his story changed once again. He now spoke of sexual relations with three Congressmen, and gave the FBI a third name. But now, Williams added other names and allegations. For the first time, Williams said he had procured a male prostitute for a Senator, congressional staff member, and Government Printing Office employee.

In his first interview with investigators from this Committee on July 9 and 10, Williams also lied. Questioned about the thefts of a female page's purse, of another page's automobile, and of a checkbook and cash from a family friend in Washington, Williams made up an elaborate story about the stolen car and also had an innocent explanation for the stolen purse. On the second day of this interview, however, he admitted that he had taken the purse, had in fact stolen the car, and \$120 in \$20 bills and some checks from his friend's purse.

On July 8, 1982, Williams failed a lie detector test administered by the FBI.

(b) Retraction by Leroy Williams.—By late August, interviews with many pages and other individuals had established there was no corroboration for Leroy Williams' allegations. Under the circumstances, the Special Counsel decided Williams should be reinterviewed and confronted with the evidence. Extensive preparations were undertaken to prepare for the interview. Investigators diagrammed the offices of each of the Members of the House of Representatives with whom Williams alleged he had sexual relations. They noted unusual design features to test if Williams could provide details, since he claimed he had sexual relations with each Member in that Member's office. They interviewed the Congressmen's staffs to obtain information about the Congressmen to be used in questioning Williams.

On August 26, 1982, investigators met with Williams in Little Rock, Arkansas. During this interview, Williams admitted for the first time that the allegations that he had had homosexual relations with Members of Congress were false. He also admitted that the allegations that he had arranged sexual liaisons between male prostitutes and a Senator, a Congressman's staff employee, and an employee of the Government Printing Office, were also false.

Following these admissions to the investigators, a deposition was scheduled for the morning of August 28, 1982 in Washington. On that day the Chairman and Special Counsel deposed Williams in executive session in the presence of his attorney.

Williams testified that he had left Washington and the page program in late January, 1982 as a result of the problems he had experienced from excessive drinking:

Because of the pressure that had been put on me because of [my supervisor's] suspecting my homosexuality, the pressures of the job, the fact that I was literally an alcoholic because I had gotten to the point where I felt like every day at lunch I had to have a drink in order to go through the rest of the day. Those situations scared me a great deal and I decided that it would be better for me to be at home because I had too much of my life left to ruin it all at such an early age.

Williams testified that when he was interviewed by the CBS news reporter in June of 1982, he made up the story about having sexual relations with Members of Congress. He told the Committee under oath:

It was my intention to create a story that would be credible and drastic enough that it would cause enough public interest in order to cause people to look at the page system and look at what was going on and basically that was my reason.

Williams testified under oath that he never had sexual relations with any Member of Congress. He specifically denied under oath that he had ever had sexual relations with the Congressmen he had named, that he had had sexual relations with the Senator he had named or that he ever arranged a liaison between the Senator and a homosexual prostitute.

He testified that Committee investigators had not pressured him or attempted to pressure him into changing his story. Rather, he said he had decided to tell the truth:

Mainly because the mental depression and the pressure of the fraud that I created was just overwhelming and I knew, or at least I felt like, there had been enough attention brought to the pages where there were going to have to be modifications. So at that time, I did not feel like there was any reason to continue in the fraud because I was ready to tell the truth because the pressure was just overwhelming. It had gotten to the point where I wanted to end my life. So I knew that time it had become drastic enough for me to disclose the truth.

(3) Investigative findings

(a) Allegations against Members of Congress.—At various times, Williams alleged that he had had sexual relations with three Members of Congress and that he had procured a male prostitute for a Senator. In two instances, the evidence obtained, in the judgment of the Special Counsel, proves—independent of Williams' recantation—that Williams' allegations were not true. In the other two instances, Williams' vagueness about dates has limited the Special Counsel's ability to develop definitive proof. But all the evidence that has been obtained contradicts Williams' allegations.

(i) Allegations for Which Detailed Evidence Was Obtained

Congressman A:¹⁰ Williams told two versions of his encounter with Congressman A. On July 7, Williams told the FBI the following story about Congressman A: In November, 1981, Congressman A approached him on the House floor and asked him to come to his office after the session. Williams discussed the situation with a fellow page who was a close friend. That evening he went to Congressman A's office, at about 6 p.m. where the Congressman expressed his desire to become better acquainted with Williams. This encounter lasted only 10 minutes and involved no sex. Over the next two weeks Congressman A once again approached him on the House Floor and asked him to come by his office. Williams said he went to Congressman A's office at approximately 6:00 p.m. that same day, where he was alone with the Congressman. Williams alleged that he and Congressman A engaged in homosexual relations for approximately one hour.

Two days later, Williams told Committee investigators a slightly different story. He said he had sexual relations with Congressman A in November, 1981 after the first approach by Congressman A on the House floor. He again said, however, that he joined Congressman A in the Congressman's office at 6 p.m. He said that the sexual relations were unsatisfactory to both of them and that Congressman A never approached him again.

Although the inconsistencies in the stories raise questions about Williams' credibility, both stories are consistent with respect to time—6 p.m.—and Williams' allegation that the liaison occurred on a work day sometime in November 1981.

Investigators in the Special Counsel's Office have reconstructed Congressman A's time during the month of November 1981. That reconstruction indicates it was not possible for Williams to have been alone with the Congressman in his office between 6 and 7 p.m. in November, 1981 on a night when the House was in session. One staff member stayed in Congressman A's office every week night, except Tuesdays, during November, 1981, until at least 8:00 p.m., an hour after Williams claimed he was with the Congressman. The staff member served as secretary and receptionist between 6 and 8:00 p.m. and was aware if the Congressman was in his office and who was with him. She has stated under oath that the Congressman was never alone with a page in his office while she was there. If the meeting with Williams occurred during the week, it would have had to occur on one of the Tuesday nights during November when this staff member was not on duty.

The Special Counsel's office obtained and examined the Congressman's schedule and travel records for November 1981. These records show that Congressman A was not in Washington on three of the four Tuesdays in November. On the one Tuesday he was in Washington, the Congressman's records show that the Congressman was assigned the job of watching the floor for his party, and the Congressional Record shows that he was on the floor of the

¹⁰ Since the Special Counsel has concluded the allegations concerning these Congressmen are false, no names will be used in this report.

House until 7:39 p.m., more than one-half hour after Williams alleges their liaison terminated.

The House was in session on only one Saturday in November, 1981—Saturday, November 21. That evening, Congressman A went to dinner with another Congressman at a restaurant on Capitol Hill, between 6:00 p.m. and 7:30 p.m. The Special Council has obtained a copy of Congressman A's charge account receipt showing a charge at this restaurant on this date. The Special Counsel's staff has also interviewed the Congressman whom Congressman A said accompanied him to dinner that night. The Congressman confirms that he did in fact go to dinner with Congressman A immediately after the House session on November 21 at the restaurant named.

Congressman A requested that he be deposed, and he has sworn under oath that he never propositioned Williams, never had sexual relations with him, and in fact never even knew him.

Finally, the page whom Williams claimed he told about the approach from Congressman A denies that Williams ever mentioned the matter.

In sum, based on the evidence obtained by the Special Counsel's office, it appears virtually impossible for Williams to have had sexual relations with Congressman A in his office between 6:00 and 7:00 p.m. on any work day in November, 1981.

Senator B; In July, Williams also made allegations to the FBI and this Committee's investigators about Senator B. Senator B is outside the jurisdiction of this Committee. However, to test Williams' credibility, the Special Counsel did investigate the allegations Williams had made.

On its face, Williams' story about Senator B strains credulity.

Williams alleged that in the latter part of November 1981, his work as a page overseer required him to make frequent trips to the Senate where he became acquainted with Senator B. Williams stated that during one conversation the Senator asked him if he knew someone named Roger. Williams said that Roger, whom he had met two or three times, was a male prostitute employed by an "outcall" prostitution agency, Friendly Models. Williams said he told the Senator he did know Roger and the Senator then requested Williams to contact Roger for him.

According to Williams' story, the Senator asked Williams to arrange a liaison between Roger and the Senator at Williams' apartment. Williams told the Senator that he could not use his own apartment, but he could use the apartment of a friend with whom Williams was staying at the Watergate South apartments. Williams said he agreed to make the necessary arrangements, and subsequently, contacted the Senator's office by telephone leaving a message with a secretary that the appointment was set for 11:00 p.m. that evening. The Senator arrived at the apartment shortly after 11:00, after Williams' friend had gone to bed. After the Senator arrived, Williams claimed he contacted Friendly Models and requested Roger be sent to the apartment.

According to Williams, Roger did come to the apartment. After drinks, Williams said that Roger and the Senator went into the master bedroom for approximately one hour. Afterwards, as the Senator was leaving, he asked Williams to call his office if there was any way he could be of assistance to Williams. Williams al-

leged that approximately one week later, he telephoned the Senator's office and told a secretary that he wanted to work as a Senate page. The secretary told him she had a memorandum from the Senator indicating she should help Williams in any way possible. In a later conversation with this secretary, Williams said he was told that his application had been sent to "the appropriate Committee." Before the Committee made its decision, however, Williams had decided to return home, and did not pursue the matter.

The independent evidence developed by the Committee shows virtually every statement in this story to be untrue.

"Roger" and Senator B: Unrelated to this Committee's investigation, the Arlington County Police had executed a search warrant and obtained the records of Friendly Models on March 18, 1982. The Arlington Police provided the Special Counsel's Office with the following information: The records of Friendly Models show Leroy Williams was a client of Friendly Models. Those records indicate a visit by "Roger" to Williams on November 15, 1981, at the street address of the Watergate Apartments. This was the only time that the records showed an employee of Friendly Models made a visit at William's request to the Watergate apartments during 1981. (Williams had previously been visited by "Roger" on one occasion in August at his room on Capitol Hill.)

The Special Counsel's staff interviewed and deposed "Roger." "Roger" testified he had a homosexual liaison with Leroy Williams—not a Senator—at the Watergate apartments on November 15, 1981. He denied having relations with Senator B and testified that Senator B was not present. "Roger" also took an FBI polygraph examination. It was the opinion of the examiner that "Roger" showed no deception when he denied the liaison with the Senator.

Senator B on November 15, 1981: The Special Counsel obtained and reviewed Senator B's records concerning his schedule, airline ticket receipts, and credit card receipts for the period Friday, November 13, 1981 through Monday November 16, 1981. These records indicate that Senator B was in his home state all day on November 15 and did not return to Washington until November 16.

Calls to the Senator's office: Williams alleged he made at least one call to Senator B's office the day of the liaison. He claimed he spoke with a secretary. But November 15, 1981, was a Sunday, and the Senator was out of town.

Weather: Williams alleged that on the night of the liaison there had been some snowfall. Official Weather Bureau records show that the first snowfall of 1981 did not occur until November 24, 1981, some nine days after the evening Roger visited the Watergate.

In conclusion, the Special Counsel has found that independent evidence totally contradicts Williams' allegations about Senator B and supports the conclusion that he lied in making this allegation.

(ii) Allegations Regarding Other Two Members of Congress

Williams also told the FBI and investigators for this Committee that he had sexual relations with Congressman C, and with Congressman D.

Congressman C: In the case of Congressman C. Williams initially told inconsistent stories. In his interview with CBS News, Williams said he had had sexual relations with the Congressman on three occasions. When he talked to the FBI two or three days later, however, Williams told them that he had had sexual relations with Congressman C on only two occasions.

In addition, details of the story that Williams told the FBI about his encounters with Congressman C differed from those he provided to investigators from the Special Counsel's office.

Congressman C has denied ever propositioning or having sexual relations with Williams. He has said that he never met alone under any circumstances with Williams and does not know him. Congressman C took a polygraph examination, and the examiner's opinion was that the Congressman was telling the truth when he denied knowing Williams and denied having homosexual relations with him.

Investigators from the Special Counsel's Office have inspected the logs of the Congressman's Office and have interviewed his staff. His staff members have been shown photographs of Williams. No one recalls Williams visiting Congressman C's office on any occasion.

Congressman D: In the case of Congressman D, Williams also told inconsistent stories to the FBI and to the Special Counsel's investigators. Williams told the FBI that Congressman D had initially propositioned him at a reception given by a Congressional Committee, which Williams named. Williams told the FBI he had declined that night, but that the sexual liaison occurred the following day after he was again propositioned by the Congressman. However, Williams told this Committee's investigators that he did go to Congressman D's office right after the reception and had sexual relations at that time.

Congressman D was interviewed by the Special Counsel's staff about Williams' allegations. He denied that he ever propositioned Leroy Williams or had sexual relations with him. He denied even knowing Williams. Congressman D also denied attending the reception at which Williams claimed to have met him as the sponsoring Committee did not involve an area of primary interest or concern to him. An inspection of his office records did not indicate any occasion when Williams was in his office. His staff could not recall that Williams had ever been in his office. Committee investigators showed Congressman B's staff photographs of Williams. No one picked him out as someone they recalled seeing around the office.

In sum, all the available evidence supports the conclusion that Williams lied about Congressmen C and D.

(iii) Allegation of Procuring Prostitutes for a Congressman's A.A. and an Employee of the Government Printing Office

Williams alleged for the first time in his July 7, 1982 FBI interview that in August, 1981 he had procured male prostitutes from Friendly Models for a Congressman's administrative assistant (AA) and for an employee of the Government Printing Office (GPO). Williams said both of these liaisons took place on the same evening at his apartment. Williams stated that he obtained a prostitute

named "Donnie" for the AA and a prostitute named "Bob" for the GPO employee.

Evidence obtained by the Special Counsel supports the conclusion that Williams lied in making these allegations. The records of Friendly Models do indicate that on August 11, 1981, male models "Bob" and "Donnie," the prostitutes with whom Williams claimed he arranged dates for the GPO employee and the AA, answered calls from Leroy Williams. Investigators from the Special Counsel's office have located and interviewed both "Bob" and "Donnie." Both men confirm going to Williams' apartment on the same night in August, but both said that Williams was their only client and he did not procure their services for someone else.

The Committee investigated and deposed the AA for whom Williams said he arranged a homosexual prostitution liaison in August. The AA testified that he did not have sexual relations with Leroy Williams or with a male prostitute on any occasion.

Committee staff unsuccessfully attempted to locate the former GPO employee. GPO records, including credit union records, the GPO employee locator and the federal government communications operator did not list a present or former GPO employee with the name of the person for whom Williams said he arranged the date with "Bob."

(b) Further allegations by Williams.—Williams also repeated some allegations of sexual misconduct he had heard second-hand from others. These allegations amounted to little more than gossip, and, under other circumstances, would hardly merit serious investigation. But, to assure that the investigation was complete, these allegations have also been investigated. The evidence developed has, without exception, shown nothing to support them.

Allegation: Williams testified that he had been told that a female page whom he named had sexual relationships with two Congressmen, although he had no first-hand information of either liaison.

Investigative findings: Investigators interviewed the page and both Congressmen allegedly involved, and attorneys on the Special Counsel's staff took the page's testimony under oath at a deposition. They all denied the relationship.

Investigators showed a photograph array containing the page's picture to the staff of both Congressmen, none of whom recognized the page as someone who frequented the offices.

The page's two roommates stated under oath at depositions that to the best of their knowledge she had not been dating or having an affair with a Congressman.

The two former pages who Williams said told him about one Congressman's relationship with the page were deposed. Both denied under oath knowing anything about any such relationship, and both denied telling Williams or anyone else about such a relationship.

Another former page, whom Williams said told him about the second liaison, was also deposed under oath. He denied ever making such a statement to Williams.

Allegation: Williams also testified that it was "rumored" that this female page was set up by a page supervisor with the second Congressman. Williams testified he heard this information from the page who told him about this liaison. Williams had no personal

knowledge of such a liaison or whether the page supervisor had a role in setting up the liaison.

Investigative findings: Committee investigators identified those pages who worked most closely with the page supervisor, and interviewed and/or deposed each of them. None of the pages had any personal knowledge or had ever heard any rumor that the page supervisor had ever arranged or attempted to arrange dates between a female page and either of the Congressmen mentioned by Williams, or between any page and anyone else. The pages testified that they had no reason to believe that the page supervisor was arranging dates between pages and others or that any page was involved sexually with any Member of Congress.

The page who was supposed to have told this story to Williams denied under oath ever making such a statement.

That page supervisor named by Williams was also deposed under oath, and also denied having ever been involved in any such activity with a page or a Member of Congress.

Allegation: Williams also alleged under oath that a Member of Congress "propositioned" a female page. He testified that the Representative merely called the page desk in October, 1981, and asked to speak with the female page, who was unavailable. According to Williams, the Congressman later called the Cloakroom and asked her if she would drop by his office after adjournment; she reportedly declined, saying she was going home immediately after work because of school.

Investigative findings: The female page testified that she was never approached by the Congressman Williams mentioned, that she did not tell Leroy Williams, or any other page or anyone else that she had been approached, or that she was propositioned by that Congressman. She testified that some male pages "often" said to her that they were "sure" she had been propositioned by someone, but she insisted to them that this was not true.

The page's roommate testified under oath that she never heard anything about her roommate being propositioned by anyone.

C. Jeffrey Opp

Jeffrey B. Opp was the other page who appeared, with his identity concealed, on the June 30 CBS News broadcast. In that broadcast, he alluded to one "homosexual approach" that a Congressman had made to him. But interviews with the FBI and this Committee, Opp made two different types of allegations:

1. allegations based on his personal experience, and
2. allegations based on information that he had heard from other people.

The Special Counsel has found nothing to support any of these allegations.

At his deposition before this Committee, Opp testified:

That interview was a—it was a 16 year old kid satisfying his ego. That interview was my being—was me being, as I have said, holier-than-thou, * * * and being able to rationalize everything in my mind meant I had to be adamant, I had to be definite, I had to say this is the way it is and lay

it on the line, and not take into consideration my bias, which I did not at that point.

Opp further testified that his conversation with the CBS reporter had left him:

[P]anicked, scared, * * * holier-than-thou, wanting to prove something, and I used what [the reporter] said and I convinced myself of it even though at the time he was saying it I didn't believe it, I convinced myself that it was true and then that this Hill just needed to be cleaned up.

In retrospect, Opp testified that he did not feel that he had acted responsibly in making the charges that he had made. He concluded that he had exaggerated the significance of his personal experiences in his discussions with the CBS reporter, with the staff of his congressional sponsor, and with the Justice Department.

A careful evaluation of information provided by Opp has yielded not a single instance in which there is responsible evidence that improper actions occurred. All the evidence we have developed—including significant changes in Opp's own story when he was questioned under oath—indicates that there is no support for his allegations.

(1) Background

Jeffrey Opp was appointed as a page under the sponsorship of Congresswoman Patricia Schroeder and served as a page from January 4, 1982 until June 12, 1982.

Opp considered himself far to the left on the political spectrum and went out of his way to challenge authority and to make sure that people were aware of his extreme left-wing political views. For example, the Deputy Doorkeeper recalls a conversation in which he recommended to Opp that he open a checking account in order to deposit his salary and draw checks for his personal expenses; Opp responded that, for ideological reasons, he did not believe in using banks.

There was substantial tension between Opp and his supervisors in the Doorkeeper's office. The supervisory staff who had contact with Opp had a strong negative impression of him. One supervisor told Committee investigators that he did not like Opp personally and believed that most of the pages did not like him. That supervisor also felt that Opp had serious emotional problems.

For his part, Opp felt that his supervisors believed that he should not have been a page. Opp felt that his supervisors' attitude toward him was based on the fact "that I preached socialist ideals, * * * that I didn't look like a page, because I let my hair grow longer than I should have, I didn't tie my tie all the way while in session, I was not your model page."

Opp also resented his involvement in the investigation of pages conducted by Sgt. Grossi of the Capitol Police. Opp said he believed this investigation would lead to his termination as a page. When Sgt. Grossi's investigation concluded, the Doorkeeper visited Congresswoman Schroeder to complain about Opp's conduct. Following the Doorkeeper's visit, Congresswoman Schroeder's staff admonished Opp. Opp's reaction to the investigation is evident from the

telephone call he made to one of Congresswoman Schroeder's staff threatening that if the pages' conduct was going to be criticized, the pages would take a few Members of Congress down with them.

The allegations that Opp has made must also be considered against the background of his reputation for exaggeration and for "blowing things out of proportion." Obviously, the evidence concerning Opp required that his statements be subjected to a critical and searching analysis.

(2) Opp's direct conversations with four individuals

In his interview at the Department of Justice and his interview by Committee investigators a few weeks later, Opp related four personal experiences that, he asserted, had overtones of homosexual solicitation.

(a) The four conversations.—

Congressman E: Opp testified that on May 25, 1982 the House was working very late into the evening, and he was on duty on the House floor. Opp was asked to help Congressman E make copies of some documents to be distributed to House Members. Congressman E and Opp were in the Speakers Lobby, a small area off to the side where a copying machine is located. Opp said that he stood approximately two feet away from Congressman E while the machine was copying. They stood silently for about 30 or 40 seconds, when Congressman E moved to within a foot of Opp. Opp recalled that the Congressman put his arm around Opp and pulled him "in an ingratiating move." Congressman E then allegedly asked, "You want to come to a party tonight? I could show you some fun." Opp said he told the Congressman, no, and moved away. After the machine finished making the copies, Opp handed the copies to the Congressman, and the Congressman left the area. The entire incident took only two minutes.

Opp has consistently maintained that he interpreted the actions of Congressman E as being "an overt sexual proposal." He testified, "I took it to mean that if I would have gone to that party, I would have had fun via having sex with him." Opp testified that he had no contact with Congressman E before this incident and had none after it occurred, except that the Congressman would look at him strangely when they encountered each other on the floor.

Congressman E has said that he does not recall ever meeting Opp. He did not recognize Opp's photograph when it was shown to him. Congressman E said that he rarely asked pages to run errands for him and did not know many of them. Congressman E said that he had only attempted to use the copying machine in the Speaker's Lobby on one occasion, several years before, and had found the machine broken. He had not attempted to use the machine again; he habitually used another machine which he regarded as better. He speculated either that Opp has confused him with another Member or was inventing the entire incident. Congressman E recalled a somewhat heated exchange he had had on the floor with Congresswoman Schroeder, Opp's sponsor, some weeks before the alleged incident. He thought it possible that Opp was retaliating against him out of a misguided sense of chivalry.

Congressman F: Opp's interpretation of a brief conversation with Congressman F has varied. According to Opp, on the night immedi-

ately after he had been approached by Congressman E, the House was also in session late. Opp testified that he was approached at his desk on the floor of the House by Congressman F who also asked him if he wanted to attend a party. According to Opp, the Congressman made a gesture with his hands to his nose. Opp told the FBI that he interpreted this gesture to mean there would be cocaine at the party. He told Congressman F he was not into that sort of thing, and the Congressman said nothing else about it. The conversation lasted less than a minute, and Opp had no contact with the Congressman either before or after this one conversation.

Opp told the FBI that he did not feel that the Congressman was making homosexual advances toward him. But three days before the FBI interview he told Congresswoman Schroeder's staff that he did interpret the gesture to be sexual. When he first met with Committee investigators in July; he also said he considered Congressman F's invitation to a party and his sniffing gesture to be a sexual approach. Opp explained that the reason he perceived sexual overtones in the incident was that offering drugs to a page "goes hand in hand with homosexual acts."

In his deposition in September, Opp reverted to the view that he did not believe there was anything sexual involved. Rather, he testified that he regarded the incident as relating strictly to cocaine use.

Congressman G: Opp's interpretation of a conversation he had with Congressman G changed over the summer. He told the FBI in June that the conversation involved a sexual advance. In September, he testified that he was not so sure. The incident occurred while the House was in session, late one night in early May. The conversation with Congressman G occurred at approximately 11:00 to 11:15 p.m. in the Republican Cloakroom. Two employees who worked in the snack bar were within two or three feet of Opp and Congressman G when they were talking and there were other Congressmen milling around. He and Congressman G were standing at the snack bar, and the Congressman asked "Where do you go after this?" Opp said he responded, "Home to bed." The Congressman then asked, "Don't you ever go out?" When Opp said yes, the Congressman asked where he went. Opp replied, "Penn. Ave."—meaning the nearby bars and restaurants on Pennsylvania Avenue. As Opp tells the story, the Congressman then said that he also went there and that "[i]t is strange we have not seen each other." Opp said the Congressman then said, "We should see each other sometime."

The conversation lasted less than a minute. Opp said that he had had no further contact with Congressman G prior to that incident, other than taking messages to him on the floor, and that he had had no contact with him since that incident.

Opp told the FBI that he considered the incident to have sexual overtones. But at the time of the deposition Opp testified that he was "not sure * * * I am not positive. It strikes me as being odd; it strikes me as being strange, and certainly it could be, it could have been, but I am not positive."

When asked the basis of his concern that there had been sexual overtones to the conversation, Opp said that Congressman G is "an aloof man" who "does not come on nicely to people." He also said

that he had had some concern because of the reaction of the two women who worked behind the snack counter. At his deposition, Opp testified that one of these women told him upon his return a short time later, "Got to watch out." In previous interviews, he had described the women as "eyeing" him "warily" or clicking their tongues.

When the Special Counsel's staff interviewed Congressman G, he was incredulous. He did not know anything about Opp except what he had heard in the media. He said that he had never met Opp and did not know what he looked like. After being shown a photograph of Opp, he still said he did not recognize him. When asked specifically about a conversation that might have occurred late at night at the snack bar, Congressman G said that it was certainly possible that if the House was in session late at night he would get a sandwich from the snack bar and that if he did that, he would probably make conversation with someone standing nearby, including a page.

But he said that the notion that someone would sexually proposition a page in the snack bar was preposterous. The snack bar counter is only about seven feet long and there are two women who work behind it who would overhear any conversation. Furthermore, there are many other persons moving about in a relatively confined space who would also overhear. The Special Counsel's staff has visited this area and has found Congressman G's description accurate.

Lobbyist: Opp told the FBI in June that a woman lobbyist had been providing male pages for homosexual relations with Members of Congress. He did not know her name. He described her to the FBI only as a "very large woman."

Opp explained to Committee investigators in July that this charge was based in part on an encounter he had with her. Opp did not know the woman's name, but described her as blonde, obese, and having a prominent nose. He said he met this woman at a doorway to the House Floor and she remarked, "These guys could use some help from time to time. Do you think you could help?" Opp declined and went on his way. Based on this exchange, Opp had concluded she was seeking to arrange sexual liaisons. By September, Opp changes his mind about this conversation. He testified at his deposition that he had "probably misread that incident."

(3) Investigative findings

It is difficult not to dismiss Opp's original stories, particularly about the lobbyist, as ludicrous on their face. Had it not been for the serious public concern about the "page scandal," Opp's charges would not have even warranted investigation. Nonetheless, to the extent possible, the Special Counsel attempted to investigate these charges. The Special Counsel looked for methods of investigating Opp's charges in ways other than by simply questioning the participants, who, assuming any wrongdoing, would be likely to deny it. This proved to be a difficult task. In each instance, the only thing which was alleged to have occurred was a brief conversation between Opp and another person. The two snack bar attendants Opp thought had overheard the conversation between Opp and Con-

gressman G were interviewed by Committee investigators, but neither remembered the incident.

In an effort to seek some independent evidence, the Special Counsel deposed three former pages, all friends of Opp, whom Opp claimed he had told about his various experiences, if these witnesses could establish that Opp had at least related consistent versions of these events to them, more or less contemporaneously with those events, that consistency would have some limited corroborative effect. While all three former pages recalled Opp's informing them of at least one encounter with a Member of Congress, none of their recollections of these incidents were consistent with each other, and all were different from Opp's version of events.

Finally, two of the three page friends testified that they did not believe aspects of Opp's story at the time he first told it to them last Spring. One testified that Opp was undergoing some difficult personal problems at the time. The second testified that aspects of Opp's story were "ridiculous" and that he was very concerned that innocent people named by Opp would be damaged if Opp's allegations appeared in the press.

It is the Special Counsel's view that Opp's interpretation of these incidents has more to do with his own idiosyncratic reaction to situations rather than misconduct on anyone's part. All his allegations of personal experiences were nothing more than brief conversations. There was no sexual contact, no sexual harassment, no overt misconduct. The fact that Opp himself has retreated from his conclusion that two of the four incidents had sexual overtones and has expressed doubts about the third, further suggests that the "advances" were more imagined than real. The total absence of any corroborating evidence and Opp's general reputation only reinforce this conclusion. Under scrutiny, Opp's allegations of sexual misconduct arising out of these personal encounters simply collapse.

(4) Information From Others

In his initial interview with the FBI, Opp passed on a number of stories of misconduct that he said were told to him by the CBS news reporter. These included a number of named Congressmen allegedly involved in homosexual ring of 25 to 50 Congressmen for whom pages were procured for sex by an employee of the Doorkeeper's Office. Opp said his knowledge about these allegations was limited to what he said he has been told. The CBS reporter declined to discuss with the Special Counsel what he had said to Opp, much less the basis for any allegations that had been discussed.

Without the reporter's cooperation, only one of these allegations had sufficient detail to warrant investigation: that a sex ring was operating out of the Doorkeeper's Office. Investigators in the Special Counsel's Office interviewed every employee of the Doorkeeper's Office about this allegation and deposed four of the key employees. Every page or former page who was deposed was asked about these allegations. Absolutely no support was found for the charges. Indeed, it is almost impossible to imagine a sex ring of the magnitude alleged flourishing in secrecy in the fishbowl of Capitol Hill.

Opp did make three other allegations about sexual misconduct of Members of Congress which the Special Counsel did investigate.

These all concerned incidents of which Opp had no first-hand knowledge. No evidence has been found to support a single allegation.

Congressman H: Opp told the FBI he believed Congressman H was having sexual relations with a male page. Opp based this conclusion on four specific observations. First, Opp claimed that on three separate occasions, the page said that he was going to drive Congressman H to the airport so that the Congressman could fly to his home state. But Opp said that on each occasion, Opp saw Congressman H on the House floor or in one of the office buildings the next day. Second, Opp once overheard a House employee who worked on the Floor of the House say to the page, "You got to get to know these people a lot better to stay here." The employee also told the page, "Go on about your business and I will tell you when it is time." Third, Opp testified that on one occasion he had asked the page "what the hell he was doing" after one of these conversations and the page said that he "needed to stay here." Fourth, the page had obtained appointments from several different Members of Congress.

Solely on the basis of these observations, Opp concluded that the page was having sex with Members of Congress and specifically with Congressman H in order to keep his job.

Opp's view of these incidents had changed radically by the time of his deposition in September. He said that at the time he talked with the Justice Department officials about this allegation.

[E]verything had the taste of, you know, perversion acts and that type of thing, and at this point I just, after rehashing with myself, using a bit of hindsight, and thinking that—back then I was doubting; I was doubting myself; I was doubting people I was in contact with; I was doubting all the congressmen who I had idolized at some point and so it was very easy to assume that.

But after rehashing and hindsight, I was thinking the situation probably was that he was looking for an appointmentship.

In the Special Counsel's judgment, the basis advanced by Opp for his original allegation is so flimsy and farfetched that it is not credible on its face. Nonetheless, the page in question has been deposed. The page testified that he never told Opp that he was driving Congressman H to the airport unless he actually drove the Congressman to the airport. The page testified that he drove the Congressman on one occasion. The page further testified that he was not solicited by nor did he engage in homosexual relations with the named Congressman, with any other employee or staff member of the House of Representatives, or with any Member of Congress.

In addition, the House employee named by Opp was interviewed and provided a sworn affidavit. The House employee denied being involved in any homosexual activity and said that he cautioned the page to get to know the Members' faces so he could get a job in the Cloakroom.

Congressman H has said that he sponsored this page after the page's prior appointment by another Member had expired. The

page contacted someone on Congressman H's staff who investigated the page's credentials and recommended that Congressman H sponsor him; Congressman H did not interview or meet the page prior to sponsoring him.

Congressman H used his pages as drivers on occasion. On one occasion he had an early morning flight to his home state from Baltimore-Washington airport. Rather than leave his car at the airport, he drove to the page's house, picked up the page, drove to the airport, and left the car with the page to drive back to Washington. This incident may have triggered Opp's speculation about the pages driving him to the airport.

Congressman H noted that he never used any of his female pages to drive him anywhere in the evening because he was concerned that someone who spotted him getting into a car driven by a young woman would speculate about their relationship. He adhered to this position despite his wife's protest that he was discriminating against his female pages. (The pages liked to drive the Congressman because it gave them the opportunity to talk to him and get to know him.) The Congressman found it ironic that he should be accused of having a sexual relationship with a male page because the page had driven him.

There is simply no evidence whatsoever to support Opp's initial allegation. Indeed, as Opp himself came to recognize, the "evidence" Opp cited in support of the initial allegation does not support it at all.

Congressman I: Opp told the FBI that an employee of the House of Representatives gave a party in April, 1982, at which Congressman I "came on physically" to a certain page. Opp said that the advances made by Congressman I were "groping stuff." Opp did not attend the party himself, but claimed to have had a conversation with a page who did. Opp named three other pages who were present at the party.

Based on Opp's allegations, the Special Counsel interviewed and deposed the page involved, and a number of other pages. The page who was reportedly the victim of the uninvited physical advances testified he had never been at the home of a House employee where Congressman I was present—totally contradicting what Opp had reported. The page further testified that he did in fact attend a party at Congressman I's house in April or May, 1982. There were approximately 12 other people in attendance, including the Congressman, his wife and children, one or two page supervisors and at least one of their wives, and several Cloakroom pages. The page testified that the Congressman made no advances to him. The page further testified he did not tell anyone that the Congressman had made any physical advances to him.

Another page who attended the party testified that the party occurred around May 25, 1982. In addition, this page testified he saw no advances by the Congressman or physical contact between the Congressman and any page. Nor was he told about any such advances or physical contact.

Interviews with and depositions of more than half a dozen other pages and individuals who were present at the party, including page supervisors, corroborate this testimony that there was no such sexual advance at Congressman I's party by the Congressman.

These individuals also said they knew of no party at the home of the House employee attended by the Congressman. Congressman I in an interview also denied the story. A photo array containing the photograph of the page was shown to I's staff. No one recognized the page.

It is wildly improbable that the Congressman would have made the type of advance described by Opp in the presence of his wife and children, who, all of the witnesses agree, attended the party. No evidence supports Opp's allegation; to the contrary, all available evidence leads to the conclusion that the allegation is false.

Congressman J: Opp testified that he had heard that Congressman J was sleeping with a female page. Opp said that the page's roommate, and Opp's own roommate had both told him about this relationship. According to Opp, the page's roommate had told Opp at a party that the Congressman was paying the page's rent. Opp said he was told that the page would purchase a money order, using funds supplied by Congressman J to pay her share of the rent. Opp's roommate repeated essentially the same information about this page and the Congressman approximately one month later—telling Opp this information also came from the page's roommate.

The Special Counsel's staff interviewed and deposed the page and her two roommates, one of whom had allegedly told Opp about the affair. Each of them denied any knowledge of such an affair.

The Special Counsel also took the following steps:

The Committee subpoenaed bank account records of the page and her roommate who collected the rent checks and sent them to the landlord. Those records reflect no evidence of a monthly payment from Congressman J. The records are consistent with the page's testimony that she paid her share of the rent by check on a monthly basis.

The Congressman's secretary who handled his personal finances was interviewed and deposed. She testified there were no records consistent with a pattern of regular monthly payments in the amount of the page's rent, and that the records reflected no payments to any pages.

An investigator examined the House Finance Committee's periodic reports on Congressman J's office expenditures. There were no payments from his office account to pages or for money orders. Nor were there any payments consistent with a pattern of monthly payments of the page's rent.

An investigator also examined the cancelled checks from the Congressman's personal account for the pertinent period. These checks reflected no payments to the page, no purchase of any money orders, and no pattern of payments consistent with the monthly payment of the page's rent.

The Committee investigators also showed to Congressman J's staff a group of unmarked photographs of female pages including the page supposedly involved in the affair. No one on the staff remembered the page as someone they had seen in Congressman J's presence.

Congressman J responded to detailed questions from Committee investigators and denied the affair.

In sum, no evidence could be found to suggest that Congressman J paid the page's rent or was involved in any sexual relationship with the page. The page's roommate testified that it was possible that this rumor resulted from a joke she had made about the fact that the page regarded the Congressman as attractive.

D. Other allegations

During the course of the investigation pursuant to H. Res. 518, the Special Counsel has received a number of allegations of improper or illegal sexual conduct by Members, officers, or employees of the House of Representatives. The Special Counsel has concluded his investigation of the allegations set out below. They fall into two categories. The first set of allegations proved unfounded. The second set of allegations proved to have insufficient grounds to warrant further investigation either because of the staleness of the incidents or because the allegations concerned individuals no longer associated with the House of Representatives.

Allegation: The Special Counsel received an anonymous letter charging that a Congressman had raped a participant in a university's internship program who had been placed in Washington, D.C. The anonymous author claimed that the director of the program was aware of the incident.

Investigation: The Special Counsel's staff interviewed the program director, two other university staff members, and an intern who had allegedly been placed in Washington, D.C. The director denied any knowledge of such an incident. The director advised the Special Counsel's investigators that he had previously been questioned about this charge by three local newspaper reporters who had each received a copy of the same anonymous letter just prior to the 1982 congressional election. The other interviews established that there were no interns from this program in Washington, D.C., during the term of office of the accused Congressman.

Conclusion: The Special Counsel has found no evidence to support the allegation as described in the anonymous letter and has terminated the investigation of this matter. The timing of the allegation suggests that the anonymous source hoped to embarrass the Congressman immediately before the election.

Allegation: The Special Counsel's staff was told by two sources that a former female page had dated a House employee. Neither source could identify the employee, although one source said that the employee was a "page supervisor." Also, an anonymous caller named a particular page supervisor as being "involved with female pages."

Investigation: The Special Counsel's staff interviewed and deposed the female page. The page denied dating any Member, officer, or employee of the House, and was unable to recall anything she might have said that would have suggested that she had dated a page supervisor. However, she acknowledged that she often made joking remarks that others took to be serious. Her roommate testified that she was prone to exaggerate her social relationships. Other pages cited this female page as the source of other unfounded rumors. In numerous interviews and depositions of other pages, the Special Counsel inquired about whether the named supervisor was involved with female pages. No page knew anything about it.

Many pages knew this supervisor and testified that the allegation was wholly inconsistent with their experience and perception of the individual in question. The individual was deposed and denied the allegation under oath.

Conclusion: The Special Counsel has found no evidence to support further investigation.

Allegation: A former page told the FBI and the Special Counsel's staff that a Congressman had asked a female page to go out with him. The female page asked two male pages to accompany her and the Congressman to Georgetown. At the conclusion of the evening the Congressman drove the pages home and remained in the car with the female page after the two male pages had gone inside.

Investigation: The Special Counsel's staff deposed the page who made the allegation as well as the female page allegedly involved. The third page named in connection with the incident was interviewed. The female page testified that the Congressman had never asked her to go out alone with him. On the evening in question, he had offered to give her and her friends a ride to Georgetown. She testified that the Congressman drove them to Georgetown, accompanied them to a club and drove them home. She testified that he never made a sexual advance to her. The statements of the second male page were consistent with those of the female page. Both the female page and the second male page stated that the page who made the allegation had consumed so much beer while at the club that his memory of the evening was unlikely to be reliable.

Conclusion: The Special Counsel has found no evidence to conclude that the Congressman made a sexual approach to the female page.

Allegation: A former page told the FBI of a conversation he had had with a Congressman in which the Congressman apparently propositioned him.

Investigation: The Special Counsel's staff deposed the page who gave a different, wholly innocent, account of a conversation with the same Congressman. Other statements of the page who reported the allegation suggested that his initial interpretation of events was questionable and that he frequently tended to assert conclusions that, in the judgment of the Special Counsel, had no rational basis. The Congressman was interviewed and does not recall having met or conversed with the page, although he acknowledged it was his habit to "make small talk" in the Cloakroom where this incident was alleged to have occurred.

Conclusion: The Special Counsel has found no evidence to support the allegation.

Allegation: In response to the Special Counsel's letter to former pages, a former female page wrote that, in the corridor of a House Office building, a male who she believed to be a Congressman had put his arm around her waist and invited her into an office. She wrote that she "turned down the offer."

Investigation: The Special Counsel's investigators interviewed this page twice. The page described the incident as a "joke," and recalled that she had laughed at the time. She reviewed photographs of all Congressmen who fit the physical description she gave and was unable to recognize any as the man who had approached her.

Conclusion: The Special Counsel has found no evidence to suggest that any misconduct occurred.

Allegation: A former page alleged that statements and conduct of certain female pages led him to believe that Capitol Police had been sexually involved with three female pages, two of whom had been Senate pages.

Investigation: The Special Counsel's staff reinterviewed and deposed the page who made the allegation, and forwarded his statements about the former Senate pages to the Senate. The former female House page denied that she had had any sexual involvement with Capitol Police. Testimony of the page who made the allegation had been contradicted on a variety of matters by other evidence which has raised serious questions about his credibility. In addition, a former aide of his sponsor has questioned his credibility.

Conclusion: The Special Counsel has found no evidence to support further investigation.

In several instances, the Special Counsel received allegations of improper or illegal sexual conduct that occurred many years ago, or by individuals who had once been but were no longer Members, officers, or employees. Further investigation of these allegations will not be pursued.

Respectively submitted,

JOSEPH A. CALIFANO, Jr.,
Special Counsel.

Dated: December 14, 1982.

APPENDIX A.—FEBRUARY 1982 PAGE INVESTIGATION BY U.S. CAPITOL POLICE

The United States Capitol Police (U.S.C.P.) conducted a brief investigation into allegations of misconduct involving pages in early February, 1982. This investigation was triggered by the discovery in Leroy Williams' apartment of another page's missing wallet and by information from Williams' landlady about drunken parties.

The Committee received allegations that the U.S.C.P. investigation had been prematurely terminated. These allegations implied that the U.S.C.P. had information relevant to the Committee's investigation pursuant to House Resolution 518. This Committee and the Special Counsel agreed that the Special Counsel should investigate the conduct of the U.S.C.P. investigation.

The Special Counsel has reviewed the written records of the U.S.C.P. investigation, and has interviewed or deposed (a) the Capitol Police detective who carried out the investigation and his superiors; (b) individuals in the offices of the Doorkeeper and the Sergeant-at-Arms; (c) Members of the House and their staffs who received information about the U.S.C.P. investigation, and (d) pages who were interviewed by the U.S.C.P.

The Special Counsel's inquiry has been directed at the following questions:

1. What was the scope of the police investigation, and what information did it obtain?
2. Was the investigation prematurely terminated?
3. What action was taken as a result of the investigation?

4. Did the police inquiry itself unintentionally contribute to rumors which later led to public allegations of sexual misconduct involving Members of Congress and pages?

FACTS

A. Initiation of the investigation

The last day on which Leroy Williams worked as a page was Friday, January 29, 1982. That weekend he moved out of his apartment at 24 Third Street, N.E., and left Washington, D.C.

Following Williams' departure, his landlady found certain items in the apartment he had occupied. These included literature and other items strongly suggesting homosexual interests. In addition, she found a wallet belonging to a female page.

Williams' landlady contacted the House Doorkeeper's office and was referred to Sergeant John D. Grossi of the Capitol Police. Grossi had earlier been assigned to investigate the disappearance of the wallet found in Williams' apartment. On February 2, 1982, Williams' landlady met with Grossi to give him the wallet. During this meeting, she told him that she had also found some pornographic literature in Williams' room, including what appeared to be a directory of male prostitutes. She also reported to Grossi that Williams' neighbors had complained to her about loud, late-night parties attended by pages at Williams' apartment. She and Grossi discussed the possible use of drugs and alcohol at these parties.

After his conversation with Williams' landlady, Grossi met with his superiors, Deputy Chief Gilbert Abernathy and Chief James M. Powell of the U.S.C.P., and related what he had learned. Chief Powell then telephoned House Sergeant at Arms Benjamin R. Guthrie, who is the representative of the House of Representatives on the Capitol Police Board. Arrangements were made for Grossi to brief Guthrie on the information he had received relating to pages.

Grossi met with Guthrie in Guthrie's office in the Capitol on February 2 or 3, 1982. After that meeting, Grossi and Guthrie met with House Doorkeeper James T. Molloy, whose staff supervises the work of House pages. In both meetings, Grossi discussed the information which he had received from Williams' landlady regarding page conduct. He told Guthrie and Molloy about the missing wallet and the homosexual material found in Williams' room. He also told them about the allegations of page participation in loud, late-night parties at which drugs and alcohol may have been consumed. He was instructed to investigate the allegations, and to report back to Guthrie.

B. Grossi's interviews of pages

Over the period of a week, from February 4 through February 10, 1982, Grossi questioned eight pages. He reported back to Guthrie twice—once in the middle of this period and once at the end.

On Thursday, February 4, Grossi interviewed three pages about their personal activities and those of other pages. According to his interview reports, these pages told him about all-night "drinking parties" in Williams' apartment, attended by other pages; the use of drugs by Williams; and consumption of alcohol by pages at parties and at various commercial establishments. One or more of the

three also told Grossi that Williams and a second page had taken pages to Fourteenth Street (an area of Washington frequented by prostitutes, which has a high concentration of pornographic bookstores and nightclubs). At least on the trips organized by the second page, the pages were alleged to have used the services of prostitutes. Grossi's report names eight pages as being "involved, directly or indirectly" in the various activities described by the three pages.

On Friday, February 5, Grossi personally delivered the written report of his interviews with these three pages to Guthrie and discussed with Guthrie the information obtained in these interviews. Guthrie immediately arranged a second meeting with Molloy to provide him with the information in Grossi's reports.

By Monday, February 8, Grossi received information suggesting that Williams might have been responsible for the theft of a page's car, which had disappeared on January 6, 1982. On that day, he learned that both the car and Williams were in Tuscaloosa, Alabama. He conveyed this information to Guthrie on February 9 and also provided it to the Metropolitan Police who were responsible for investigating the stolen car.

Also on February 9, Grossi reinterviewed one of the pages he had interviewed earlier and interviewed another page for the first time. His written reports state that these pages told him that they believed Leroy Williams was a homosexual, that the pages "had no further information regarding any other pages that were homosexuals" or about homosexual activities among pages or nonpages. The report of Grossi's interview with the page he interviewed for the second time indicates that she said she did not know of any adults from the House or Senate attending any parties which she attended. The interview reports also included information about the use of alcohol by pages at parties given by Williams and others, the willingness of Washington commercial establishments to serve pages alcohol, the use of drugs by pages, and trips by pages to Fourteenth Street allegedly to pick up prostitutes. One of these pages also told Grossi about two separate fights involving two male pages.

Grossi's reports indicate that on February 10, he interviewed three additional pages. These three interviews focused on an incident at a page party in which a page had struck someone on the head with a bottle.

On February 11, 1982, Grossi wrote a summary report in which he listed eight pages whom he had interviewed.¹

The summary report included this paragraph:

With the exception of the few cases of misconduct as indicated by prior reports involving Pages, this investigation could find no further indications of sexual overtones or misconduct involving Male or Female Pages or non-Page adults.

Also on February 11, Grossi wrote a second report indicating that he met with Guthrie at 9:30 a.m. on that day, and that, at the

¹ No individual interview report appears to exist for one of the pages listed, but this page has confirmed that Grossi did in fact question him.

direction of Guthrie, the page investigation was terminated. This second February 11 report indicated that, as a result of the investigation, four pages, including Leroy Williams, were being dismissed. Grossi wrote no more reports as part of his investigation. On June 25, 1982, he was contacted by a television reporter asking questions about the investigation. At that time he wrote a summary report of the investigation for his superiors.

Some of the pages whom Grossi interviewed have reported lines of questioning that are not reflected in Grossi's written reports. One page testified that Grossi asked her if she had ever been approached by a Member of the House of the Senate and if she had ever heard anything about Williams being approached by a Member of Congress. This page said that she heard that Grossi asked the same questions of everyone else. She also testified that Grossi's questions led her to believe that Leroy Williams had "some kind of sexual involvement with Congressmen."

Grossi himself has denied under oath that he asked any page about being propositioned by Members of Congress. He said that he had no reason to ask such questions. But he testified that he believes he did ask pages about propositions from "nonpage adults." He testified that the only conversation he had with pages specifically regarding a Member of Congress related to a Member who allegedly had asked some pages out for a drink. Grossi could not recall who had told him about this, and he had never learned the Member's name.

A second page testified that Grossi asked her if Williams was involved with a prostitution ring, and if he was a liaison for Congressmen. Grossi testified that he asked the pages about sexual contact between pages and between pages and non-page adults, and he "probably" asked all of them if Leroy Williams was a homosexual. But Grossi does not recall asking the questions described by the page.

A third page testified

That Grossi told him that one of the reasons another page was dismissed was "conclusive evidence that he was prostituting himself on Fourteenth Street as well as picking (prostitutes) up;" and

That Grossi asked questions about these "prostituting activities" and about the sexual activities of yet another page.

Grossi said he heard early in his interviews that Williams and another page were taking pages to Fourteenth Street, and that he probably asked other pages about this allegation in subsequent interviews. However, he denies having told anyone any page was fired for prostitution. In fact, Grossi said he did not learn of any page's dismissal until the termination of his investigation. Thus he could not have given anyone any reason for a page's dismissal during his interview.

Based on the interviews and the evidence, the Special Counsel concluded that Grossi did ask about pages' sexual conduct and about contacts with adults, but did not ask about Members of Congress or about Williams and prostitution. Rather the Special Counsel has concluded that these subjects were the result of assump-

tions or speculation on the part of pages about what lay behind Grossi's investigation.

C. Termination of the investigation

Grossi's reports indicate that Sergeant at Arms Guthrie instructed him to terminate the page investigation on February 11, 1982. Grossi has testified that the termination of the investigation at this stage was a surprise to him, inasmuch as he had not yet spoken to all the pages implicated in earlier interviews. In particular, he had planned to interview the second page, in addition to Williams, who was alleged to have taken other pages to Fourteenth Street. He said, however, that it was his understanding that the matter was to be handled "administratively," and that, while police involvement was no longer required, the questions raised by the investigation would be addressed.

Guthrie has testified that it is his recollection that, at the time of the termination, Grossi himself felt that he had pursued the matter as far as he could. Guthrie recalls that the pages who had not been interviewed had left Washington and were no longer accessible to the Capitol Police. In any event, on February 11, Guthrie felt that the investigation should be concluded. He pointed out that the investigation had been initiated by the police because of a page's missing wallet, and the primary suspect in the theft of the wallet, Leroy Williams, was then far from the jurisdiction of the Capitol Police. The information about page misconduct had been forwarded to the Doorkeeper of the House, who was responsible for the pages. Guthrie, therefore, felt that he and the police had done as much as they could.

Guthrie's recollection is supported by Grossi's first February 11 report, which the evidence indicates was given to Guthrie at the time Grossi met with him on February 11. In tone and in content that document suggests a final report.

Guthrie testified that he provided Grossi's written report to Molloy immediately following the February 11 meeting.

D. Action taken as a result of the investigation

(1) Notification of sponsors

Before the investigation ended, but after Guthrie and Molloy had received Grossi's report of his first interviews with pages, they met with House Speaker Thomas P. O'Neill to inform him that an investigation of pages was in progress. This meeting took place in the Speaker's office, probably on Friday, February 5 or Monday, February 8. Guthrie recalls that Molloy showed the Speaker the written reports of Grossi's interviews, but Molloy does not recall that he did so. Both agree that the meeting was brief; that it was solely to inform the Speaker, and that it was consistent with their practice to keep the Speaker advised of developments within their respective areas of responsibility.

Neither recalls with any specificity what was said at the meeting. Molloy says that he told the Speaker that an investigation of page activity was being conducted, but is uncertain that he specified it was being conducted by the police. He also says that he may have mentioned allegations regarding the stolen car, wild parties,

beer drinking, and homosexual activities. He says that he may have mentioned the possibility of homosexual activities involving Members of Congress, although he testified that he had not heard any allegations relating to Members and pages at this time. Guthrie recalls only that Molloy briefed the Speaker regarding the investigation. Both recall that the outcome of the meeting was that the Speaker instructed Molloy to inform the congressional sponsors of the pages of the information being developed about their pages.

The Speaker himself also recalls this meeting lasted only a few minutes. He remembers that Molloy told him there had been a problem with a page and that the problem involved the theft of a car and a wallet. He does not recall more than one page being mentioned. He does recall telling Molloy to inform the page's sponsor.

Over the next several days, Molloy contacted or attempted to contact the sponsors of pages named in Grossi's interview reports. Molloy recalls that he reached most of the sponsors or their staff, although he also recalls that he was unable to reach some of the sponsors. Most of those contacted by Molloy report that they received very little information regarding the substance of the investigation. Only Williams' sponsor, Representative Bethune, and one other sponsor reported receiving any indication of allegations of homosexual activity. In most cases Molloy simply reported that the page in question had been named in an investigation of misconduct.

Representative Bethune was visited by both Molloy and Guthrie on February 9. Guthrie and Molloy reported to Bethune about the items found in Williams' room indicating homosexual interests, the parties in his apartment, the allegations regarding trips to Fourteenth Street, and the evidence suggesting that Williams had stolen a page's wallet and another page's car. It is Bethune's recollection that there was no mention of any information relating to Members of Congress.

2. Dismissals

Molloy dismissed two pages. He testified that the performance of these two pages had been criticized by his staff in the past. In addition, Molloy said at the same time that Grossi reported they were misbehaving, he received reports from the Page School indicating that both had failed to meet minimum academic requirements. Considering all these factors, Molloy decided to send these pages home.

Grossi's final report indicates that a fourth page was also dismissed. In fact, this page was not dismissed. Molloy testified that he considered dismissing this page, because he had heard that the page had a drinking problem and that he was a source of trouble among the pages. But one of Molloy's subordinates told Molloy that the page performed well on the job. Molloy said that the page's Congressional sponsor also argued against his dismissal. Molloy decided to let the page stay, but instructed one of the page supervisors to speak to him regarding his behavior.

3. Warning to other pages

The Deputy Doorkeeper, Jack Russ, called a meeting of House pages in which he announced that some pages would no longer be in the program. The purpose of this announcement was to warn other pages of the consequences of misconduct. Molloy testified he was not a participant in this meeting and did not know it occurred.

E. Rumors resulting from the police investigation

Grossi's questioning of pages clearly lead to speculation among the pages about the origin and purpose of the investigation. The rumors and gossip stimulated by the investigation in fact greatly complicated the task of reconstructing what actually occurred in the course of the inquiry. Two examples should demonstrate how some of the rumors began. The evidence obtained by the Special Counsel supports Grossi's testimony that he asked the pages he interviewed about sexual contacts between pages and "non-page adults." At least one page who was interviewed assumed from that question that she was being asked about approaches by Members of Congress. Undoubtedly that page in turn told other pages that the U.S.C.P. was investigating sex between Members of Congress and pages.

The second example involves other pages interviewed by Grossi. A male page testified that Grossi had hinted about pornographic material, drugs, and a stolen wallet having been found in Williams' apartment. The page said that he had compared notes with a female page also interviewed by Grossi to try to figure why Williams was involved in these things. At that time the female page had said that Williams was acting as liaison between Congressmen and prostitutes. The male page said he believed his colleague was surmising this from Grossi's line of questioning.

This testimony is corroborated by that of another male page, who said he heard the same female page say that Williams had been involved in setting up a prostitution ring for Members of Congress. He said this remark occurred in a conversation in which pages were speculating about the reasons for the Grossi investigation.

Whatever the source of this rumor, it was plainly in active circulation before Grossi's investigation was even completed. On February 11, a staff member at the Democratic Study Group called a staff member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to report a rumor that a page sponsored by Representative Bethune had been sent home. The rumor had a variety of details—most inaccurate—including the claim that the page was a homosexual who had been "pimping" for Members of Congress. The staffer who called in this rumor reports that he heard it from a staff member in Representative Schroeder's office. This staffer in turn heard the allegation from a page, Jeffrey Opp.

CONCLUSIONS

A. Scope of the investigation

Based on the evidence obtained in the course of this investigation, the Special Counsel has found that the U.S.C.P. investigation was based on allegations of misconduct by pages, and that at no

time in the course of the investigation did the police receive any significant allegations of misconduct by anyone else. The investigator conducting the inquiry did receive information that an unnamed Congressman had invited some pages to have a drink. But the investigator was also told that this invitation was not accepted. He asked questions of pages regarding their contacts with adults. While some pages recall that he asked questions regarding Members of Congress, no one has ever said that any information about misconduct by Members was ever provided to the U.S.C.P. Sergeant Grossi himself has testified that he received no information about Members of Congress, other than the information regarding the invitation for a drink. There is no evidence that the police ever received any other information in the course of this investigation which suggested misconduct by any Member or nonpage employee of the House.

B. Termination of the investigation

The Special Counsel has found it important to distinguish between two questions. First, from a law enforcement point of view, was the investigation prematurely terminated? In other words, were there indications of criminal activity that were intentionally ignored by the Capitol Hill Police when the investigation was concluded?

But this question must be distinguished from a second question that raises the broader responsibilities of the House of Representatives in supervising pages. That question is the following: Was appropriate follow-up action taken by someone in the House on the basis of the information developed by the Capitol Hill Police?

We turn first to the law enforcement question.

The Committee has deposed both House Sergeant-at-Arms Guthrie and Sergeant Grossi and has interviewed Grossi's police superiors, Deputy Chief Abernathy and Chief Powell, regarding the propriety of the termination of the police investigation. All agree that there was no longer any criminal matter to investigate when the inquiry was concluded on February 11. In their view, Grossi's effort began as an investigation of a stolen wallet. The prime suspect in that case, Williams, was hundreds of miles from the jurisdiction. Given the petty nature of the offense, there was no practical possibility of extradition. The stolen car, which did come to Grossi's attention in the course of the investigation, was a crime that was within the jurisdiction of and being investigated by the Metropolitan Police, not the U.S.C.P. (Grossi did inform the Metropolitan Police of the information he received regarding the car.) Grossi had received no other allegations of criminal activity within U.S.C.P. jurisdiction. Therefore, from the point of view of the Capitol Police, there was nothing further to investigate.

There is no evidence that the decision to terminate the Capitol Police investigation had its roots in any effort to conceal evidence of criminal misconduct or to conceal evidence of wrongdoing by Members, officers, or employees of the House. The Special Counsel has found no indication that the police possessed any such evidence or information.

But there clearly was a serious failure on the part of the House as an institution. While it may have been acceptable to conclude

the police investigation, information had been developed that required further action.

Grossi's investigation left the following questions outstanding:

1. Had minor pages in fact visited Fourteenth Street area and used the services of prostitutes?
2. Were commercial establishments in the vicinity of the Capitol routinely and consciously serving alcoholic beverages to minor pages?
3. Were pages using illegal narcotics?
4. Were pages attending all-night parties, to the detriment of their school and work performance?

But no further official inquiries were made by officers or employees of the House to answer these questions, until allegations of homosexual conduct involving Members of Congress and pages were publicized by the media in late June and early July, 1982.

No one took action that was plainly required. Specifically, nothing was done to determine with certainty whether pages had used the services of prostitutes. More importantly, nothing was done to prevent such activities in the future. No action was taken to stop several commercial establishments known to be patronized heavily by pages from serving them alcohol. No action, other than the implied threat in the announcement that two pages had gone home, was taken to stop the practice of all-night drinking parties by some pages.

In the judgment of the Special Counsel, the current fragmentation of responsibility for the pages resulted in a serious failure on the part of the House as an institution. Pages are sponsored by individual Members of the House. At work, they are supervised by the Doorkeeper's Office. The House requires the parents of a page to sign a written statement "assuring full responsibility for the safety, well-being and supervision of the [page] while living in the District of Columbia area." The Capitol Police have a narrow jurisdiction, and the metropolitan Police can hardly be expected to focus on the welfare of pages scattered in apartments on Capitol Hill.

Based on the evidence received in the course of this investigation, the Special Counsel believes that there is an urgent need for the House of Representatives to fix responsibility—formally and in writing—for the supervision of pages after working hours. In the Special Counsel's judgment, the lack of clear responsibility led directly to the failure to address the serious problems of misconduct that developed among the pages in 1981 and 1982. If the House chooses to employ teenage high school pages, establishing a page dormitory and a Page Board are steps in the right direction. But unless responsibility for supervision of teenage pages after working hours is clearly established, the problems that developed in 1981-82 are likely to recur.

APPENDIX B

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT,
Washington, D.C., September 27, 1982.

Mr. JOHN FERRUGIA,
CBS Television News,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FERRUGIA: On July 13, 1982 the House of Representatives adopted House Resolution 518 which authorizes the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to carry out an investigation of—

- (1) Alleged improper or illegal sexual conduct by Members, officers, or employees of the House;
- (2) Illicit use or distribution of drugs by Members, officers, or employees of the House;
- (3) The offering of preferential treatment by Members, officers, or employees of the House, including congressional pages, in exchange for drugs or sexual favors.

The Committee has appointed me as Special Counsel to conduct this investigation.

Copies of House Resolution 518, which authorizes the investigation, the statement of Representative Louis Stokes, Chairman of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, and my response at the time of appointment are enclosed.

In the course of our investigation, information has been received concerning statements you made in the course of interviews you conducted earlier this year. That information indicates that you stated to individuals whom you interviewed that you had knowledge of improper or illegal conduct by Members, officers or employees of the House of Representatives, within the scope of House Resolution 518, and that in at least some cases, you identified the person involved in such conduct.

Since the Committee has charged me with the responsibility to conduct a thorough investigation, I am requesting that you provide us with any information that you have falling within the scope of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 518. As a first step, I request that you meet with Mr. Hamilton P. Fox III of this office to discuss these matters, in House Annex II, Room H-2-507, at 3:00 pm, October 6, 1982. We are aware of the delicacy of the relationship between any government investigation and the press, but I believe it is important that we seek the cooperation of the press where a reporter has already disclosed the names of individuals to a number of people he has interviewed.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH A. CALIFANO, Jr.,
Special Counsel.

CBS,
Washington, D.C., October 14, 1982.

JOSEPH A. CALIFANO, Jr., Esq.
Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

DEAR MR. CALIFANO: I am replying to your September 27 letter to CBS News Correspondent John Ferrugia requesting that he meet with your staff in connection with your investigation pursuant to House Resolution 518. In your letter, you state that you have received "information" that Mr. Ferrugia stated to individuals whom he interviewed that he had knowledge of illegal or improper conduct by Members, officers or employees of the House and that, "at least in some cases," he identified such persons. Based on subsequent conversations with your staff, it is our understanding that a principal purpose of questioning Mr. Ferrugia would be to help assess the reliability of information obtained from certain individuals already interviewed by your staff.

As we have indicated we believe that sensitive First Amendment questions are raised by your request, even if it is limited to the above purpose. Because of the important issues involved, your request has received very careful consideration both by Mr. Ferrugia and the management of CBS News.

For many years, it has been the general practice of CBS News to provide to government agencies only that information concerning its news reports which is a matter of public record. In this respect, we are pleased to enclose transcripts of all television reports broadcast by CBS News on this story. However, your request for an interview goes beyond the as-broadcast materials, and into the area of unpublished information. It is Mr. Ferrugia's strong conviction and that of CBS News as well, that a discussion concerning unpublished material would unacceptably compromise the independence which would characterize the relationship between the press and the government.

In our view, questions as to whether and why particular statements were made during interviews with news sources go to the heart of the editorial process and are beyond the scope of legitimate inquiry by the government. It is obvious that reporters must ask questions in the course of gathering information for a story, that those questions often involve inquiries as to specific facts, and often as well involve attempts to confirm information already in the reporter's possession. (In the instant case, these questions involved not only inquiries about alleged misconduct but inquiries as well about the efforts of Members of the House to investigate such reports.) To later be interrogated by government investigators about what questions were asked and answers given can only chill the news gathering process.

We also believe it important to emphasize, in light of the significance which is apparently now being attached to statements allegedly made by Mr. Ferrugia, that CBS News believes that he acted entirely properly in his investigation and reporting of this story. Mr. Ferrugia's reports were completely factual, and dealt largely with allegations which were being actively investigated by the Justice Department, the FBI, the Arlington Police, the Speaker's Special Commission on Pages, and the Committee itself. Moreover,

given these investigations by government authorities, it is reasonable to believe that information which you might seek from Mr. Ferrugia is obtainable directly from these authorities.

In sum, the reports aired by Mr. Ferrugia represented what he and his superiors at CBS News concluded could be responsibly broadcast. Other information collected or discussed in the course of his inquiry has remained and must remain private and privileged. For the Committee to seek out such information from the reporter would, in our view, constitute a serious and unwarranted intrusion into the basic right of the press to go about its business on reporting, editing and publishing without governmental interference. Accordingly, Mr. Ferrugia, with the full support of CBS News, respectfully declines to be interviewed by the Committee staff.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH DE FRANCO,
Washington Counsel.

APPENDIX C

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT,
Washington, D.C., August 20, 1982.

DEAR ———: The House of Representatives has authorized the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to investigate alleged improper conduct by any Member, officer, or employee of the House in the following three areas: (1) alleged improper or illegal sexual conduct, (2) illicit use or distribution of drugs, and (3) the offering of preferential treatment to employees of the House, including Congressional pages, in exchange for drugs or sexual favors. The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has appointed me as Special Counsel to conduct this investigation.

Copies of House Resolution 518, which authorizes the investigation, the statement of Representative Louis Stokes, Chairman of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, and my response at the time of appointment are enclosed. As those documents indicate, the Committee has charged me with responsibility to conduct a fair, impartial, thorough, and expeditious investigation.

One part of the investigation is specifically concerned with House pages, and I am writing each individual who, like you, has served as a page during the last three years. I hope your service as a page was an educational, personally rewarding, and worthwhile experience. But we need to know whether you have any information that relates to the subjects under investigation. The Committee and the House need your assistance.

I am sensitive to the delicate nature of the subjects of this investigation. We intend to conduct this inquiry in a fashion which will avoid unnecessary embarrassment to anyone. We are not seeking rumor or gossip. Rather, we are seeking any information that you have from personal knowledge or that you have received from a source who you believe to be reliable and truthful. If you have such information relevant to the three subjects of the Committee's inquiry mentioned in the first paragraph of this letter and the enclosed House Resolution, I urge you to provide us with it. To the

extent your experience indicates that allegations of improper conduct in the areas under investigation have no basis, we would appreciate hearing from you on that score as well.

Please contact me by sending a letter or by telephone. A properly addressed, franked envelope is enclosed for your convenience. If you prefer, you may call Jerry McQueen, Hamilton Fox, or Richard Cotton of our Special Counsel's office. You can reach them at: 202/225-8891 or 202/226-7760, and you may call collect. Because it is important to conduct this investigation as expeditiously as possible, if you do have information, you should contact us by September 15, 1982.

Those of you who have information may feel yourself caught between a personal desire not to be involved and your responsibilities to the House, to future pages, and as a citizen. Having served as a page, you are more aware, than most young Americans of the importance of the House of Representatives. I encourage you to assist the House and the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in carrying out this investigation in order to preserve the integrity of the House and the confidence of the American people in our democratic institutions.

We are asking for your voluntary cooperation. It is important to the House of Representatives and your nation that you provide that cooperation, and I urge you to do so.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH A. CALIFANO, Jr.,
Special Counsel.

APPENDIX B

STATEMENT OF ALLEGED VIOLATION IN THE MATTER OF GERRY E. STUDDS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

COUNT ONE

During the period May, 1973, through August, 1973, the respondent, Gerry E. Studds ("Studds"), who at all times relevant to this Statement of Alleged Violation was a Member of the House of Representatives, did conduct himself in a manner which did not reflect creditably on the House of Representatives in violation of clause 1 of the Code of Official Conduct of the House of Representatives, in that he engaged in a sexual relationship with a 17-year-old male page (who may have been 16 years old when the relationship began), whom he knew to be employed at that time as a page by the House of Representatives. Specifically, Studds engage in sexual acts with a congressional page at various times during the period May through August, 1973, and during a trip he took with the page overseas in August, 1973, as more fully set out in the page's testimony, attached as Exhibit A to this Statement of Alleged Violation.

COUNT TWO

On another occasion in 1973, Studds did conduct himself in a manner which did not reflect creditably on the House of Representatives, in violation of clause 1 of the Code of Official Conduct of the House of Representatives, in that he made a sexual advance to a male page, whom he knew at that time was employed as a page by the House of Representatives and who was 16 or 17 years old at the time.

Specifically, Studds met the page at a bar on Capitol Hill in a group with other pages. As the group of pages broke up that evening, Studds offered to drive the page home. The page accepted. Instead, Studds drove him to his own house where they had one or more drinks. After consuming alcoholic beverages over a period of time at Studds' home, Studds made a verbal sexual advance, which the page declined. The page told at least two individuals in 1973 about the advance.

COUNT THREE

On another occasion in 1973, Studds did conduct himself in a manner which did not reflect creditably on the House of Representatives, in violation of clause 1 of the Code of Official Conduct of the House of Representatives, in that he made a sexual advance to another male page, whom he knew was at that time employed as a page by the House of Representatives and who was 17 years old at the time.

Specifically, Studds met the page at a bar on Capitol Hill one evening after a late session in the Spring of 1973. A number of other Members of the House, pages, and staff members were also present. Along with the others, Studds and the page consumed a large quantity of alcohol. Studds offered to drive this page home. The page accepted and they left the bar. Studds then invited this page to his home for another drink. After they arrived, Studds provided the page another alcoholic drink and invited the page up to a third floor room where they sat on a bed and talked. Studds then made a sexual advance which the page declined. The page told at least one individual in 1973 about the advance.

EXHIBIT A

Q. After you met Congressman Studds, did you and he get together again shortly after that?

A. Yes. Shortly thereafter—I am not sure how long, how long it was—but I was invited to go out to dinner with him and I did. The dinner took place at his apartment in Georgetown. Would you wish a follow-up question?

Q. The follow-up question would be what happened at that dinner?

A. Well, we sat around and talked about abstract and general questions, all types and descriptions, until four in the morning, drinking vodka and cranberry juice, at which time I was told by the Congressman that he was too drunk to give me a ride home and so he said, "Why don't you sleep here?" and I did.

* * *

Q. Did you and the Congressman get together subsequent to this?

A. Yes. I would imagine we had dinner three or four additional times. Specifically I do not recall. But that is in the ballpark.

Q. And did you engage in sexual activity each time?

A. Yes.

Q. When the Congressman first invited you to have dinner and as you got to know the Congressman, how did you feel in that environment, that a Congressman was talking with you?

A. I was flattered and excited.

Q. Did you feel intimidated?

A. No, I did not. I would like to state at this time—it would probably have been better if I had stated this in my opening statement—but the Congressman or the Honorable Gerry Studds was an intelligent, witty, gentle man with I think a high level of insecurity. He did nothing to me which I would consider destructive or painful. In another time, in another society, the action would be acceptable, perhaps even laudable. Unfortunately this is not the case. I have no axe to grind with him. I have nothing negative to say about the man. In fact, I thought that he provided me with one of the more wonderful experiences of my life, if we exclude the instances of sexual experience which I was somewhat uncomfortable with. But I did not think it was that big a deal.

* * *

Q. You said you felt uncomfortable with it, did you continue with him because he was a Congressman, because he was someone you were impressed with?

A. No. Well, I kept company with him because he was an intelligent man, a fun person to be with. If I could have had my druthers, I would have had the friendship that I had with the man without the sex. And I mentioned that to him.

* * *

Q. Did Mr. Studds ever offer any preferential treatment or offer you any inducement to have a relationship with him?

A. No, he did not.

Q. Did he ever threaten you or coerce you if you did not have a relationship with him?

A. He did not. Essentially all I needed to do to stop the relationship was to walk out the door, or not go in the door, as the case may be.

APPENDIX C

STATEMENT OF ALLEGED VIOLATION IN THE MATTER OF JAMES C. HOWARTH

COUNT ONE

During the period from approximately April, 1980, through mid-June, 1980, the respondent, James S. Howarth ("Howarth"), who at all times relevant to this Statement of Alleged Violation was Majority Chief Page and an employee of the House of Representatives, violated clause 1 of the Code of Official Conduct of the House of Representatives by engaging in a sexual relationship on a regular basis with a 17-year-old female page who was at the time employed as a congressional page by the House of Representatives and was under his direct supervision. Specifically, during this period Howarth and the page spent many nights at Howarth's apartment and engaged frequently in sexual relations.

The House of Representatives has special responsibility for the teenage pages it employs. Those employees of the House who supervise pages have a derivative obligation amounting to a fiduciary duty to act with propriety toward their teenage charges.

By engaging in a sexual relationship with a female page under his supervision, Howarth breached his fiduciary duties to pages, abused the trust given him as an employee of the House of Representatives, and conducted himself in a manner which does not reflect creditably on the House of Representatives.

COUNT TWO

During the period from approximately April, 1980, through mid-June, 1980, Howarth failed to execute his duties as Majority Chief Page and dispensed special favors and privileges in violation of clause 3 and clause 5 of the Code of Ethics for Government Service and clause 1 of the Code of Official Conduct of the House of Representatives. Specifically, during this period Howarth allowed the female page referred to in Count One with whom he was having sexual relations and who was under his supervision, to absent herself from her page duties whenever she chose. These special favors and privileges constituted preferential treatment of a page as a consequence of a sexual relationship.

By violating the Code of Official Conduct and the Code of Ethics for Government Service, Howarth breached his fiduciary duties to pages, breached his obligations as an employee of the House of Representatives, and conducted himself in a manner which does not reflect creditably on the House of Representatives.

COUNT THREE

During the period January, 1979, through December, 1980, Howarth knowingly possessed a controlled substance, to wit, cocaine, in the Democratic Cloakroom of the House of Representatives in violation of Title 21, United States Code, section 844(a), clause 2 of the Code of Ethics for Government Service, and clause 1 of the Code of Official Conduct of the House of Representatives. Specifically, on one occasion during this period Howarth purchased one gram of cocaine from Robert T. Yesh, at the time an employee of the House of Representatives, in the House Democratic Cloakroom.

By violating a criminal statute, the Code of Official Conduct, and the Code of Ethics for Government Service, Howarth abused the trust given to him as an employee of the House of Representatives, breached his obligations as an employee of the House of Representatives, and conducted himself in a manner which does not reflect creditably on the House of Representatives.

COUNT FOUR

During the period January, 1979, through December, 1980, Howarth knowingly possessed a controlled substance, to wit, cocaine, in the Democratic Cloakroom of the House of Representatives in violation of Title 21, United States Code, section 844(a), clause 2 of the Code of Ethics for Government Service, and clause 1 of the Code of Official Conduct of the House of Representatives. Specifically, on one occasion during this period, Howarth purchased one-eighth of an ounce of cocaine from Robert T. Yesh, at the time an employee of the House of Representatives, in the House Democratic Cloakroom.

By violating a criminal statute, the Code of Official Conduct, and the Code of Ethics for Government Service, Howarth abused the trust given to him as an employee of the House of Representatives, breached his obligations as an employee of the House of Representatives, and conducted himself in a manner which does not reflect creditably on the House of Representatives.

APPENDIX D

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT,
Washington, D.C., November 16, 1982.

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr.,
Majority Leader,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BAKER: House Resolution 518, which was passed by the House on July 13, 1982, authorized this Committee to conduct an investigation of alleged improper or illegal sexual conduct by Members, officers, or employees of the House and of alleged illicit use or distribution of drugs by Members, officers, or employees of the House. In addition, H. Res. 518 authorizes the Committee to include within the scope of its inquiry any matters "relevant to discharging its responsibilities pursuant to [H. Res. 518] or the Rules of the House of Representatives."

The Committee has received allegations that two investigations conducted by the U.S. Capitol Police into matters that fall within the scope of H. Res. 518 may have been prematurely terminated. First, in early 1980 the Capitol Police conducted an investigation into drug activity among certain Hill staff which resulted in the arrest of several lower level Senate employees for the use of marijuana. This Committee has received allegations from officers involved with that investigation that information was developed at that time concerning possible use or distribution of illicit drugs by personnel of the House of Representatives. According to the allegations made to the Committee, this information was not properly pursued at the time. Second, the Capitol Police conducted an investigation in January and February of 1982 into the events surrounding the discharge of a House page. Questions have also been raised as to whether the January-February 1982 investigation was properly pursued.

At this time, we have no basis whatsoever to assess the accuracy or inaccuracy of these allegations. Neither the Special Counsel to this Committee nor the Committee has reached any conclusions as to whether these allegations have merit or not. This Committee has concluded, however, that the Committee should investigate these allegations as part of its responsibilities under H. Res. 518. In particular, this Committee feels obliged to investigate: (1) whether the conduct of the employees of the House who serve as Capitol Police officers violated any law or applicable standard of conduct with respect to matters covered by H. Res. 518; and (2) whether the Capitol Police have information that bears on the matters covered by H. Res. 518.

The jurisdiction of this Committee extends only to the conduct of Members, officers, or employees of the House of Representatives. The Capitol Police are supervised by the Capitol Hill Police Board, consisting of the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and the Architect of the Capitol. The Capitol Police have approximately 1200 officers. Approximately 650 of these officers are employees of the House of Representatives; approximately 550 are employees of the Senate.

The investigation which this Committee believes is necessary will entail review of the conduct of Capitol policemen who are employees of the Senate. Further, any such investigation may uncover evidence bearing on the conduct of other employees of the Senate. In any event, such an investigation into the Capitol Police conduct of the two investigations identified above will require questioning Senate employees, and may also require examination of documents in the possession of Senate employees or Senate offices. Because these matters are outside the jurisdiction of our Committee, we would like to establish a joint cooperative arrangement with the Senate that will allow the investigation to proceed while respecting the jurisdiction of the House and of the Senate.

We are prepared to work with the Senate in whatever way would be appropriate. We are also prepared to carry out the investigation utilizing our Special Counsel's investigative staff and to report to the Senate and the Senate Select Committee on Ethics any information that we acquire bearing on matters that fall within the Senate's jurisdiction.

Please let me know how the Senate would like to proceed on this matter.

Sincerely,

LOUIS STOKES,
Chairman.

U.S. SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D.C., November 23, 1982.

HON. LOUIS STOKES,
Chairman, Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have received your letter in which you request that the Senate and the House devise a working relationship that would respect the jurisdiction of both houses in order to investigate the U.S. Capitol Police conduct of two previous investigations.

In light of the allegations that your Committee has received, the Senate agrees that the investigation which you proposed should be carried out. As you recognize, the Senate and the Senate Select Committee on Ethics have exclusive jurisdiction with respect to the conduct of officers and employees of the Senate. Under the circumstances of this case, however, it would be difficult and counterproductive to initiate separate House and Senate investigations into the matters you have identified.

We believe the arrangement that would best serve the interests both of the House and Senate would be for your Committee to pursue the investigations you outlined, utilizing the investigative resources of your Special Counsel's office. For this purpose, the office of your Committee's Special Counsel may question employees of the Senate and request documents of Senate employees and offices relative to Capitol Police conduct of the two investigations in question.

To the extent that the investigation develops any information bearing on conduct of employees of the Senate, such information should be forwarded to Senator Malcolm Wallop, Chairman of the Select Committee on Ethics; Senator Howell Heflin, Ranking Minority Member of that Committee; and to me.

It is my understanding that this arrangement is acceptable to your Committee. Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr.

APPENDIX E

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT,
Washington, D.C., June 13, 1983.

JAMES J. BIERBOWER, Esq.,
*Bierbower & Bierbower, 1875 Eye Street NW.,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. BIERBOWER: Pursuant to House Resolution 518 of the 97th Congress and House Resolution 12 of the 98th Congress, the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has been conducting an investigation into allegations of "improper or illegal sexual conduct of Members, officers, or employees of the House." I have been acting as Special Counsel to the Committee in the conduct of this investigation.

In the course of this investigation, we have received allegations and obtained evidence of a sexual relationship between your client, Representative Daniel Crane of Illinois, and a House page. The evidence we have indicates that this relationship occurred in 1980.

Specifically, we have obtained sworn testimony from a former House page whose identity we have given to you that in the spring of 1980, Representative Crane engaged in a sexual relationship on several occasions with that individual, who was then employed as a House page. The sexual conduct between Representative Crane and the page occurred at Representative Crane's apartment in Virginia. The page was seventeen years old at the time. In a deposition before the Committee on May 17, 1983, Representative Crane acknowledged having had sexual relations with that individual on at least two or three occasions. In short, the evidence clearly indicates that a sexual relationship occurred between a Member of the House of Representatives and a teenage page.

The legislative history of House Resolution 518 as well as the legislative history of other House actions involving pages reflects a recognition by the House of the special responsibility the House has in relation to House pages. It is clear from this legislative history that the House of Representatives stands in loco parentis to the teenage pages it employs. As the Doorkeeper of the House has testified, the pages are the "wards" of the House. Under the circumstances, a sexual relationship between a Member of the House and a House page, even if consensual, constitutes a breach of the official obligations of the Member of the House. Any such sexual relationship constitutes the precise type of improper sexual conduct covered by H. Res. 518 and H. Res. 12 and constitutes a violation of Rule 1 of the Code of Official Conduct of the House of Representatives, which states:

A Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives shall conduct himself at all times in a manner which shall reflect creditably on the House of Representatives.

It is clear that the House has jurisdiction over this matter. In House Report 351, 96th Congress, 1st Session, pp. 3-5, the Committee most recently set forth its jurisdiction to recommend disciplinary action for conduct occurring in previous Congresses. The House subsequently adopted the recommendations of the Committee contained in this report, and censured Representative Charles C. Diggs, Jr. for conduct which occurred during the 93rd to 95th Congresses. In addition, in Report 930, 96th Congress, 2d Session, the Committee determined that the statute of limitations and the principle of laches are not applicable to congressional disciplinary proceedings. The House concurred in this judgment by the Committee, by adopting in 1980 a resolution of censure against Representative Charles H. Wilson, for conduct which occurred in 1971 and 1972.

In light of the above, it is my responsibility to recommend that the Committee take action to disapprove of Representative Crane's conduct. This matter obviously involves issues of great sensitivity for everyone, and I am particularly concerned about the page involved if there are extended public proceedings. Under the existing Committee rules, Representative Crane is entitled to receive a Statement of Alleged Violations from the Committee. Following the issuance of such a Statement, the Committee would establish a time-table for motions and briefs by counsel, and for a public hearing with testimony and cross-examination of witnesses.

Procedures other than the Committee's established ones may be more appropriate to this case. Section 8 of H. Res. 518, 97th Cong., incorporated by H. Res. 12, 98th Cong., provides that "the Committee is authorized to adopt special rules of procedure as may be appropriate." If Representative Crane does not wish to contest the factual findings of the Special Counsel and waives his right to a Statement of Alleged Violations and to a public hearing, I would be prepared to recommend that the Committee adopt the following procedure:

The Committee would provide Representative Crane with his counsel the opportunity to present to the Committee, either orally or in writing, a statement or argument concerning any legal, jurisdictional or other matters he wished to raise (including arguments in mitigation). This statement would be made before the Committee in executive session and would be analogous to the opportunity provided in Rule 11(a)(2)(A) of the Committee's Rules to a respondent in a preliminary inquiry initiated by the Committee. The Special Counsel would then file his report and recommendations with the Committee, which will include a recommendation that this report, and the facts in this case be made public, and the Committee would then act. Under this procedure, there would be no public hearing before the Committee.

The current investigation has been conducted pursuant to House resolution. In any event, the Committee wants to assure that Representative Crane has had all rights which would have accrued to him if this investigation had been carried out as a preliminary inquiry instituted by vote of the Committee. In a preliminary inquiry, Representative Crane would have the "opportunity to present to the Committee, orally or in writing a statement respecting the allegations" in

question. Therefore, Representative Crane is invited to appear before the Committee at 9 a.m. on Wednesday, June 22, 1983. If Representative Crane agrees to the procedure set out above, the June 22 meeting will afford the opportunity to present those arguments which you wish the Committee and the Special Counsel to consider. Otherwise, the June 22 meeting will serve simply as the opportunity to make a statement analogous to the one described in Rule 11(a)(2)(A).

In the alternative set out above, I have tried to propose a procedure that is fair to your client, sensitive to the interests of the pages, consistent with maintaining the integrity of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and the House of Representatives, and within H. Res. 518's proviso that the Committee is authorized to adopt special rules of procedures as may be appropriate in this investigation. This letter represents my own thinking on this issue and does not constitute any prediction of what action the Committee or House may choose to take.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH A. CALIFANO, Jr.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT,
Washington, D.C., June 28, 1983.

JAMES J. BIERBOWER, Esq.,
Bierbower & Bierbower,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BIERBOWER: As your son, Mark Bierbower, and I discussed by telephone yesterday, I am writing to assure that we both have the same understanding of the procedures to be followed in the case involving your client, Representative Daniel Crane. In your appearance on behalf of Representative Crane before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, on June 22, 1983, you stated: "We willingly accept the special rules and make the necessary waivers." Your statement indicates that Representative Crane has agreed to the proposed procedure I outlined in my letter to you of June 13, 1983. Specifically, it is my understanding that Representative Crane (1) does not contest the facts as outlined in my June 13 letter, (2) waives his right to a Statement of Alleged Violation in connection with those facts, (3) waives his right to a public hearing before the Committee in this matter, and (4) agrees that the Committee may act on the basis of (a) the report the Committee will receive from its Special Counsel and (b) your June 22 statement on Representative Crane's behalf and any written presentation submitted by you no later than close of business, Thursday, July 7, 1983.

I would appreciate it if you would confirm this statement of Representative Crane's position in writing.

The Special Counsel's report concerning this matter will be submitted to the Committee no later than the middle of July. After receiving the Special Counsel's report, the Committee will take whatever action the Committee decides is appropriate in this case.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH A. CALIFANO, Jr.

APPENDIX F

BIERBOWER & BIERBOWER,
Washington, D.C., July 7, 1983.

JOSEPH A. CALIFANO, Jr., Esq.,
*Special Counsel, Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, U.S.
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CALIFANO: Thank you for your June 28, 1983 letter concerning procedures to be followed in connection with Representative Daniel Crane.

In my appearance before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, on June 22, 1983, I did indeed indicate that Representative Crane agreed to the proposed procedure set forth in your letter of June 13, 1983. Specifically, Representative Crane (1) does not contest the facts outlined in your June 13, 1983 letter to me, (2) waives his right to a statement of alleged violation in connection with those facts, (3) waives his right to a public hearing before the Committee, and (4) agrees that the Committee may act on the basis of (a) the report of its Special Counsel, (b) my June 22, 1983 statement on Representative Crane's behalf and (c) my July 7, 1983 letter to Chairman Stokes setting forth Representative Crane's position.

Respectfully,

JAMES J. BIERBOWER.

BIERBOWER & BIERBOWER,
Washington, D.C., July 7, 1983.

Hon. LOUIS STOKES,
*Chairman, Committee on Standards of Official Conduct,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is a statement of the legal, jurisdictional and mitigating points in support of Representative Daniel Crane's position with regard to your Committee's investigation of his activity with a female page in the spring of 1980.

I. The Committee should take no action or, in the alternative, the Committee should seal the names of those involved.

A. In lieu of reporting this matter to the House and making a recommendation, this Committee may

(1) Decline to take any action with respect to the individual conduct (*i.e.* seal the file) or

(2) Report the conduct to the House, without making a recommendation, and seal the names of the individuals involved.

B. Public disclosure of the activity and names of the individuals would impose an immediate severe punishment entirely disproportion-

ate to the activity involved. Specifically, the Committee should decline to take any action with respect to the activity for the following reasons.

(1) It is evident, as Special Counsel has acknowledged, that no criminal activity is involved. The activity in no way violated any Federal, state or local law.

(2) It is debatable whether the activity constitutes "improper" sexual conduct within the meaning of H. Res. 518 and H. Res. 12, which confer jurisdiction upon the Committee.

(3) The activity does not constitute a violation of any specific provision of the Code of Official Conduct of the House of Representatives. The only such provision cited by Special Counsel is the catch-all provision of Rule 1 of the Code of Official Conduct, which states:

A member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives shall conduct himself at all times in a manner which shall reflect creditably on the House of Representatives.

(4) The activity involved no seduction. It was brief, consensual and voluntary.

(5) The activity did not involve the performance of official duties or responsibilities. The conduct was strictly "off-duty," away from Capitol Hill, and involved the privacy of two persons "on their own time," after work hours. The conduct does not fall within the generally accepted meaning of the term "improper," which relates only to conduct "not suited to character, time and place."

(6) This event involved a mature young woman with her own life to lead. It is understood that she accepts her share of blame for the incident.

(7) It is evident, as Special Counsel has acknowledged, that no favorable treatment was exchanged.

(8) If there is any limit to the postulate that the House of Representatives stands in loco parentis to its pages, this conduct must fall outside that limit. The page was not under the Congressman's patronage. She was mature beyond her years. The activity was totally unrelated to official duties. It took place away from the Hill.

(9) The conduct was over and done with more than three years ago.

(10) Reporting the conduct to the public will serve no purpose and can only be detrimental to the House and the page program.

C. There are strong mitigating factors which deserve the Committee's careful consideration and which should compel a decision against reporting the activity. The following factors strongly suggest that no action should be taken:

(1) The career of an elected politician may well be at stake.

(2) The well-being of the family of an elected politician, including his wife and five children, is at stake.

(3) The life of a young woman is at stake. Even the reporting of the activity, without names would bring tremendous pressure upon the young woman, who (we understand) is still in college. It is inevitable that her name would surface under relentless pressure

from the press. She would become instantly infamous and would suffer greatly from consequent notoriety.

II. Strong legal and jurisdictional arguments exist for a Committee decision against taking any action with respect to the conduct involved. Reporting the activity to the House would do no one any good. The arguments against Committee action outweigh any argument to report this activity to the full House. Furthermore, there are compelling mitigating circumstances which merit the Committee's reflection. The mere release of information and names to the public would cause grave, irreparable harm and punishment far in excess of any improper conduct involved.

For the foregoing reasons, the Committee should decline to act, and all references to the names and conduct involved should be sealed and stricken from any report to the full House.

We request that copies of this letter be furnished to all members of the Committee.

Respectfully,

JAMES J. BIERBOWER.

APPENDIX G

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1983.

MORRIS M. GOLDINGS, Esq.,
Mahoney, Hawkes, & Goldings,
1 Walnut Street, Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. GOLDINGS: Congressman Louis Stokes, Chairman of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, has previously informed your client, Congressman Gerry Studds, that his name has come to the Committee's attention in connection with matters being investigated by the Special Counsel's office, pursuant to H. Res. 518 of the 97th Congress and H. Res. 12 of the 98th Congress.

In that connection, Chairman Stokes and Congressman Floyd Spence, the Ranking Minority Member, have authorized me to request Congressman Studds' deposition. If it is convenient with your schedule and the Congressman's, I should like to conduct the deposition at 10:00 a.m. on April 13, 1983 in Room 321 of the Cannon House Office Building. This deposition will be conducted in executive session. The Congressman has the right to representation by counsel. Copies of H. Res. 518 and H. Res. 12, the Rules of the Committee, and the pertinent portions of the House Rules are enclosed.

If you have any questions about this matter or the scheduling arrangements, would you please contact me at 202-862-1044, or Hamilton P. Fox, III, Associate Deputy Special Counsel, at 202-225-8891.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH A. CALIFANO, Jr.,
Special Counsel.

Enclosures (4).

MAHONEY, HAWKES & GOLDINGS,
Boston, Mass., May 31, 1983.

HAMILTON P. FOX III, Esq.,
Associate Special Counsel,
Committee on Standards of Official Conduct,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FOX: I am writing this letter in response to your telephone request of May 27, 1983 to confirm that Congressman Gerry Studds has, on advice of counsel, respectfully declined the request set forth in Mr. Califano's letter of March 24, 1983 to appear for a deposition before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

My partner, Charles Francis Mahoney, and I feel that it may be useful to review briefly the grounds upon which we had advised Congressman Studds to decline the Committee's request so that counsel and, if appropriate, the Committee, may understand the basis for the Congressman's declination. We recognize, of course, that each of these issues has been raised with you before and thus we shall only summarize our position once again in this letter.

First, while we have been informed and believe that we understand the rationale behind the Committee's preference to proceed in the comparatively informal manner in which it has undertaken its investigation to date and commend the confidentiality with which the Committee has undertaken its investigation, the inevitable effect of this method of procedure as contrasted with a more formal process under the Committee's Rules is to leave a person in Congressman Studds' position without formal notice or even accurate knowledge of the precise subject matter of a potential deposition. He would therefore be unable to prepare adequately for such an appearance in view of the potential breadth of subject matter and the span of years which might be involved.

Second, our interpretation of potentially applicable claims of privilege available to a witness has resulted in our determining that such claims may not be made as effectively, and possibly not at all, in the context of a voluntary appearance for a deposition.

Third, there remain unresolved both the respective positions of counsel to the Committee and our own as to the jurisdiction of the Committee in the light of the provisions set forth in House Resolution 518 and House Resolution 12. In our prior correspondence, we have each set forth these positions, and we do not believe it would serve any particular purpose to argue them further in this letter. In view of the difference of opinion, however, counsel has necessarily weighed the jurisdictional question in advising Congressman Studds.

Notwithstanding all of the above, but without intending to waive the issues of jurisdiction or any potential claim of privilege, we have requested Congressman Studds to search his records for the documents requested in your letter of May 23, 1983 as to which I informed you there would be no necessity to issue a subpoena in order to obtain a response. As I believe you recognize, however, the material sought is ten years old and may not be now in the Congressman's possession, custody or control because of the passage of time. In order to give you a comprehensive response, we have asked the Congressman to search his records not only in Washington, but in the District, and he is doing so this week. He is scheduled to return to Washington later this week at which time he will complete the search, and I will attempt to respond to you immediately thereafter and forward whatever material has been found or otherwise write to you the results of the documents search.

Needless to say, we would be available for further discussions on any of the legal issues alluded to in this letter if you or Mr. Califano thought that productive.

Thank you for your attention in this regard.

Very truly yours,

MORRIS M. GOLDINGS.

APPENDIX H

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT,
Washington, D.C., June 27, 1983.

CHARLES F. MAHONEY, Esq.,
MORRIS M. GOLDINGS, Esq.,
Mahoney, Hawkes & Goldings,
One Walnut Street, Boston, Mass.

DEAR MESSRS. MAHONEY AND GOLDINGS: As my partner, Richard Cotton, discussed with Mr. Goldings this morning, I am writing to assure that we both have the same understanding of the procedures to be followed in the case involving your client, Representative Gerry Studds. Based on a review of the transcript of the meeting of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct on June 22, 1983, it is my understanding that Representative Studds does not accept the procedure proposed in my letter to you of June 13, 1983.

Mr. Goldings stated to the Committee:

In appearing today the Congressman does not seek a contest of the essential facts. The analysis assumes that in 1973 the Congressman and a page, who was over the legal age of consent as established by the laws of the District of Columbia, as enacted by Congress, engaged in a private sexual relationship. The facts will also require a finding that the relationship involved no coercion, harassment, preferential treatment or use of illegal drugs.

As we understand it, your statement and Representative Studds' statement further indicated that Representative Studds does not waive his right to a Statement of Alleged Violation nor his right to a public hearing under the rules of the Committee in connection with the matters discussed in my June 13 letter.

We are proceeding on that basis. As Mr. Cotton discussed with Mr. Goldings, the Special Counsel's report to the Committee concerning this matter will be submitted no later than the middle of July. We expect the Committee to act shortly thereafter.

If our understanding of your client's position is incorrect in any way, I would appreciate hearing from you in writing by the close of business on July 1, 1983. Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH A. CALIFANO, Jr.

MAHONEY, HAWKES & GOLDINGS,
Boston, Mass., June 28, 1983.

Express Mail.

JOSEPH A. CALIFANO, Jr., Esq.,
*Special Counsel, U.S. House of Representatives,
 Committee on Standards of Official Conduct,
 Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CALIFANO: In response to your letter of June 27, 1983 and confirming the discussion which Mr. Goldings had with Richard Cotton preceding receipt of that letter, the position of our client, Congressman Gerry E. Studds, is in part as stated in your letter. That is, the Congressman does not accept the procedure proposed in your letter of June 13, 1983 for the reasons set forth in the Statement of Counsel and in Congressman Studds' Personal Statement to the Committee on June 23, 1983.

Briefly, restating our view, we believe that a procedure which discloses the identity of the Congressman and a summary statement of the facts, even though not disclosing the names of other individuals, is unfair to Congressman Studds in the light of the actual facts surrounding the incidents alleged and their staleness. Further, we believe that it must be anticipated that a public disclosure will result in such intense press coverage as to render the anonymity of the individuals involved meaningless and probably inevitably engender speculation, exaggeration and sensationalism, with all of the unfairness attendant thereon.

Your letter is also partially correct with respect to Congressman Studds' not waiving his right to a Statement of Alleged Violation nor his right to a public hearing. Such non-waiver is only a portion of our position as to the proper procedures under which the Committee is presently acting. It is our opinion that Congressman Studds is entitled to the full consideration of the Committee as to whether or not a preliminary inquiry should be commenced and we have urged, and will continue to urge the Committee, not to vote such a procedure.

We are not in agreement with your apparent interpretation of the applicable resolutions and rules to the effect that the procedure afforded us, which was described as "analogous" to the presentation of a statement, substitutes for the actual procedure. We read Rule 13 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee to mandate that an inquiry begun other than by a complaint filed with the Committee under Rule 10 must still follow Rules 11 and 12 in their entirety. Specifically, we see no authorization to eliminate that portion of Rule 11 which provides that "upon completion of the preliminary inquiry, the staff of the Committee shall prepare and transmit to the Committee a report containing a comprehensive summary of the information received in the inquiry and may include in the report a recommendation for action by the Committee respecting the alleged violation which was the subject of the inquiry." So that our position will be entirely clear, the report which your letter anticipates being filed will not, in our view, satisfy the requirements of that provision of Rule 11.

Consistent with our position, we believe that Congressman Studds has the right to have the Committee determine on the basis of the "report of the Committee staff on the preliminary inquiry" whether to

"direct the staff to transmit to the respondent a Statement of Alleged Violation." We emphasize that the language contained in Rule 11(b) is that after such a Committee determination the Committee "may" so direct the staff, but we emphasize that it clearly *may not* as well. We believe that by eliminating a meaningful preliminary inquiry procedure, the Committee is not given the full opportunity to deliberate on its discretionary authority, and it was an appeal to the discretionary powers which was explicit in the presentations made on June 22, 1983.

As you know, we have consistently questioned the precise status of the procedure in this matter, but have attempted to cooperate at each stage without waiving the Congressman's rights. We wish to continue to do so. With that in mind, again referring to our Statement and that of Congressman Studds', we are asking you as Special Counsel and the Committee to give counsel an opportunity, either before the filing of your report or between the time of its filing and its final consideration by the Committee, to explore the resolution proposed in our Statement, the essence of which is a summary review of the facts without disclosure of the Congressman's name or the names of other individuals involved, concluding, if the Committee so desires, with a statement of its disapproval of such actions as a violation of Rule I of the Code of Official Conduct. No doubt there are other procedures which will preserve the intended goals proposed by our Statements, and we are available at your or the Committee's direction to meet to attempt to resolve this matter consistent with those goals.

Very truly yours,

MORRIS M. GOLDINGS.
CHARLES FRANCIS MAHONEY.

APPENDIX I

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT,
Washington, D.C., March 2, 1983.

Mr. JOSEPH VOLZ,
New York Daily News,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VOLZ: On July 13, 1982 the House of Representatives adopted House Resolution 518 which authorizes the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to carry out an investigation of—

- (1) alleged improper or illegal sexual conduct by Members, officers, or employees of the House;
- (2) illicit use or distribution of drugs by Members, officers, or employees of the House; and
- (3) the offering of preferential treatment by Members, officers, or employees of the House, including congressional pages, in exchange for drugs or sexual favors.

This investigation was reauthorized by the House in the 98th Congress in House Resolution 12, on January 3, 1983. The Committee has appointed me as Special Counsel to conduct this investigation.

Copies of House Resolutions 518 and 12, which authorize the investigation, the statement of Representative Louis Stokes, Chairman of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct at the time of appointment, and my response, are enclosed.

In the course of our investigation, we have reviewed an article you wrote, entitled, "Say Dem & Page Went On Gay Tour," which was published by the New York Daily News on July 8, 1982. That article indicates that you have knowledge of improper or illegal conduct by Members, officers or employees of the House of Representatives, within the scope of House Resolutions 518 and 12. Since the Committee has charged me with the responsibility to conduct a thorough investigation, I am requesting that you provide us with any information that you have that would enable me to identify the Congressman and the page who are referred to, but not identified, in your article. I request that you meet to discuss these matters with Mr. Hamilton P. Fox III, Associate Special Counsel, at 2:00 P.M., Friday, March 4, 1983, in Room 507 of House Annex No. 2.

We are aware of the delicacy of the relationship between any government investigation and the press, but I believe it is important that we seek the cooperation of the press where a reporter indicates that he has knowledge of a Member of Congress who may have engaged in improper or illegal conduct. I believe that your affirmative response

to this request will be consistent with your responsibilities as a member of the press.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH A. CALIFANO, Jr.,
Special Counsel.

Enclosures.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT,
Washington, D.C., April 12, 1983.

MR. JAMES WIEGHART,
Editor, The New York Daily News,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. WIEGHART: On July 13, 1982 the House of Representatives adopted House Resolution 518 which authorized the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to carry out an investigation of:

(1) alleged improper or illegal sexual conduct by Members, officers, or employees of the House; . . .

This investigation was reauthorized in the 98th Congress by House Resolution 12. The Committee has appointed me as Special Counsel to conduct this investigation.

On July 8, 1982 the New York Daily News published an article written by Joseph Volz, entitled, "Say Dem & Page Went on Gay Tour." The article stated that "A Democratic congressman took a Capitol Hill page on a tour of gay bars in Key West, Florida, during a Christmas vacation" in December, 1979. The article cited the source of this story as "a Washington resident" who said he saw the page and the congressman in a Key West bar in December, 1979. The article did not name the congressman or the page.

Since the Committee has charged me with the responsibility to conduct a thorough investigation, investigators and attorneys on my staff contacted the reporters who worked on this story, Joseph Volz and Robert Garrity of the Daily News' Washington Bureau. These reporters talked briefly with my staff, then referred all inquiries to Lars Nelson, your Washington Bureau Chief. Mr. Nelson refused to comment on the story.

While I am aware of the delicacy of the relationship between any government investigation and the press, I believe it is important that we seek the cooperation of your newspaper concerning matters you have reported which, if proven, appear to fall squarely within the scope of the investigation. In this context, it is worth noting that the Daily News and its reporter, Ken Auletta, recently cooperated extensively with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee during its hearings on the nomination of Kenneth Adelman to head the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Mr. Auletta testified before the Committee in open session, and his handwritten notes of his interview with Mr. Adelman were made available to the Committee.

Here we do not even seek either the testimony or interview notes of Messrs. Volz and Garrity. Rather we seek only whatever guidance they can give us as to the identity of the Congressman and the identity of the page. This guidance can remain strictly confidential. If the source

of this story is willing to speak with my staff, we would also like to know his name.

Since the Daily News, through one of its reporters, has recently been willing not only to testify publicly but also to furnish his interview notes, I cannot understand how my request would be unduly burdensome. Certainly my request seeks far less than the News enthusiastically provided to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, so there can be no First Amendment issue here.

I am therefore requesting that Messrs. Volz and Garrity meet with Hamilton P. Fox III, Associate Special Counsel, and Myles V. Lynk of the Special Counsel's Office in our offices at Room 509 of House Annex 2, at Third and D Street, S.W., in Washington, D.C., by April 22. Mr. Fox will contact you (or your attorneys if you designate them) to set the exact date.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH A. CALIFANO, Jr.,
Special Counsel.

THE DAILY NEWS,
New York, N.Y., April 18, 1983.

Mr. JOSEPH A. CALIFANO, Jr.,
Special Counsel, House Ethics Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CALIFANO: This is in response to your letter of April 12 regarding the investigation of the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in the alleged improper activity by members, officers or employees of the House of Representatives. In that letter, you expressed an interest in having members of your investigative staff interview two members of the Daily News Washington Bureau—Joseph Volz and Robert Gearty—regarding a story they wrote on July 8, 1982. That story alleged that “a Democratic congressman took a Capitol Hill page on a tour of gay bars in Key West, Florida,” in December 1979. You said that a member of your investigative staff talked briefly to Volz and Gearty regarding this story. But you went on to say that you are requesting Volz and Gearty meet with Hamilton P. Fox III and another member of your staff at your staff offices in Washington, D.C. by April 22 to discuss the matter further.

I have talked to Lars-Erik Nelson, our Washington Bureau chief, and to Joe Volz regarding this request and I have ascertained that Volz is unable to contribute anything beyond what appeared in his article, because of a confidentiality commitment he had given to a source. I am therefore, advising Voltz and Gearty not to discuss the matter further with members of your investigative staff.

In your letter you refer to a recent congressional inquiry in which a Daily News columnist—Ken Auletta—cooperated extensively with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I am aware of that cooperation and was a party to it. But I must say the situations are not analogous. Auletta testified under subpoena before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on an interview he held with Kenneth Adelman and on which he had written a column. In addition to his testimony, Auletta provided the committee with some notes he had taken. The notes also were reported in Auletta's original column. There was no issue of a

confidential source involved in the Auletta matter. It was simply a situation in which Auletta testified under subpoena as to what he had written regarding the issue at hand. His notes and a copy of his telephone bill for that period were submitted as further evidence that the conversation which he wrote about actually did occur.

In the situation at hand involving Volz and Gearty, there is a confidential-source relationship.

Needless to say, I regret that the Daily News is unable to be of further assistance to your investigative staff on this matter.

Sincerely,

JAMES G. WIEGHART.

○