KEY FINDINGS

A bipartisan Investigative Sub-Committee and the bipartisan House Ethics Committee both unanimously found that Schweikert committed 11 ethics violations. (p. 2)

- “The ISC [Investigative Subcommittee] unanimously concluded that there was substantial reason to believe that Representative David Schweikert violated House Rules.” (p. 2)

Schweikert admitted to all 11 violations, was reprimanded and fined $50,000. (p. 2)

The Committee found Schweikert’s violations were “serious, cumulative, and occurred on a continuous and prolonged basis.” (p. 7)

Schweikert’s fine was roughly 8% of his net worth. [Center for Responsive Politics, accessed 7/30/20]

Schweikert used campaign funds to reimburse his staff for providing personal services and goods to him, including babysitting and food – a violation of federal law. (p. 4)

- Schweikert violated “House Rules, the Code of Ethics for Government Service, federal laws and other applicable standards.” (p. 1)
- Violations: “campaign finance violations and reporting errors by his authorized campaign committees; the misuse of his Members’ Representational Allowance for unofficial purposes; pressuring official staff to perform campaign work; and his lack of candor and due diligence during the investigation.” (p. 1)

Schweikert Received Additional Penalties for Lying to the Committee. The Investigative Subcommittee determined that Schweikert’s “testimony lacked credibility” and punished him for his “lack of candor and due diligence” during the investigation. It found that he made “vague,” “misleading,” and “self-serving” statements to avoid penalties. (p. 4)

Schweikert lied on FEC reports about loaning his campaign $100,000 to artificially inflate his cash-on-hand number. The Committee called these “flagrant and egregious violations” of campaign finance law. (p. 6)

Schweikert used taxpayer funds and resources to benefit his campaign – a violation of federal law. (p. 4)

Illegally took campaign contributions from his staff. He used these contributions to “provide[e] the campaign with enough liquidity to meet its other obligations, or in other instances, allowing the campaign to post higher cash on hand totals.” (p. 6-7)

Schweikert to accurately report more than $570,000 of campaign funds – a violation of federal law. (p. 3)

Pressured official staff to work for his campaign – including to raise money for his campaign. (p. 4)
The Committee investigated but could not substantiate a claim Schweikert got loans or gifts from a Congressional employee. (p. 4)

The Committee would have given Schweikert even “harsher penalties” if there were aspects of former Chief of Staff Oliver Schwab’s testimony it could corroborate. (p. 5)

Schweikert failed to address errors in his FEC reporting for over a year after the Office of Congressional Ethics notified him of the errors. (p. 5)

**SCHWEIKERT MISLED THE ETHICS COMMITTEE**

“However, the ISC findings with respect to his lack of candor were not over minor memory lapses or slight deviations from others’ testimony but were due to its serious concerns regarding Representative Schweikert’s own affirmative and self-serving statements, some which were not responsive to any question posed, and which were squarely inconsistent with the record the ISC obtained.” (p. 5)

“Throughout the course of this investigation, Representative Schweikert made vague or misleading statements to the ISC and OCE that allowed him to evade the statute of limitations for the most egregious violations of campaign finance laws, his document productions were slow or non-responsive to several of the ISC’s requests for information regarding FEC errors, and he gave self-serving testimony that lacked candor.” (p. 6)

**SCHWEIKERT USED CAMPAIGN FUNDS TO REIMBURSE STAFF FOR PERSONAL SERVICES THEY PROVIDED TO HIM, INCLUDING FOOD AND BABYSITTING -- VIOLATION OF FEDERAL LAW**

The conversion of campaign funds to personal use violated FECA and the FEC’s implementing regulations, violated House Rule XXIII, clause 6, which states campaign funds must be kept separate and cannot be converted to personal use, and violated paragraph 2 of the Code of Ethics for Government Service. (p. 4)

“Third, Representative Schweikert misused campaign funds for personal purposes by accepting personal items from staff that were reimbursed by campaign funds. Between 2011 and 2018, at least four members of Representative Schweikert’s congressional staff paid for personal items for Representative Schweikert, including food and babysitting services, and were then reimbursed for those items by Representative Schweikert’s campaign.” (p. 4)

**SCHWEIKERT USED TAXPAYER FUNDS TO BENEFIT HIS CAMPAIGN – VIOLATION OF FEDERAL LAW**

“The misuse of Representative Schweikert’s MRA violated 31 U.S.C. § 1301, House Rule XXIII, clause 1 and paragraph 2 of the Code of Ethics for Government Service and formed the basis for Count IX of the SAV.” (p. 4)

**CAMPAIGN FINANCE REPORTING VIOLATIONS – VIOLATION OF FEDERAL LAW**
Schweikert failed to properly report $570,000 of campaign funds: Failed to disclose at least $305,000 in loans or loan repayments, at least $25,000 in disbursements, and more than $140,000 in contributions and falsely reported $100,000.40 in disbursements. (p. 3)

- “The errors violated FECA’s reporting requirements, House Rule XXIII, clause 1, which requires Members to act in a manner that reflects creditably upon the House, and paragraph 2 of the Code of Ethics for Government Services, which requires Members to uphold the laws of the United States.”

Schweikert failed to address errors in his FEC reporting for over a year after the Office of Congressional Ethics notified him of the errors. (p. 3)

Schweikert lied on FEC reports about loaning his campaign $100,000 to artificially inflate his cash-on-hand number. “Those counts detailed how Representative Schweikert’s campaign committee falsely reported that he had loaned the campaign $100,000, when no such loan had been made, and then falsely reported making $100,000 in disbursements, which served to adjust the campaign’s reported cash on hand that was propped up by the fictious loan.” (p. 6)

The Committee found Schweikert committed “flagrant and egregious violations” (p. 6)

DONATIONS FROM STAFF

Schweikert took more than $270,000 in illegal donations from four members of staff: It’s illegal House staff to spend out of pocket to boost their bosses’ campaigns, even if they are reimbursed. Chief of Staff Oliver Schwab made over $270,000 of impermissible expenditures and three other staff members made impermissible expenditures totaling less than $500. (p. 3)

- “Accordingly, Representative Schweikert did not act in a manner that reflected creditably on the House, in violation House Rule XXIII, clause 1, and failed to uphold the laws and regulations of the United States in violation of paragraph 2 of the Code of Ethics for Government Service.” (p. 3)

PRESSURED STAFF TO WORK FOR HIS CAMPAIGN, INCLUDING FUNDRAISING FOR THE CAMPAIGN

“Fifth, members of Representative Schweikert’s congressional staff were pressured to perform campaign work. Representative Schweikert’s former Chief of Staff testified that he was pressured to perform campaign work, specifically to fundraise, and in return, he had an expectation that congressional staff fundraise on behalf of the campaign. Pressuring official staff to perform campaign work violated House Rule XXIII, clause 1 and formed the basis for Count X of the SAV.” (p. 4)

KEY FINDINGS IN SCHWEIKERT’S INVESTIGATIVE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT


MOST ESSENTIAL FINDINGS
Schweikert Illegally Spent Campaign Funds for His Own Personal Use

- It is illegal to spend campaign funds for a member or candidate’s “personal use,” but Schweikert frequently had staff spend their own money for his own benefit and then reimbursed them with campaign funds. (pp. 53-56)
- These personal use reimbursements included meals in DC, babysitting, flight upgrades, and dry cleaning. (pp. 1, 54)
- These campaign donor-funded reimbursements were often disclosed as “consulting” payments to hide their true nature. (p. 42-43)
- Schweikert repeatedly used staff as nannies for his daughters. In an email, Schweikert even wrote that he wanted to hire an “unemployed female intern type person” onto his staff to serve as a taxpayer-funded babysitter. (p. 56)

Schweikert Engaged in an “Unprecedented” Scheme To Take Unlawful Campaign Donations From His Staff and to Hide the Donations

- It is illegal for House staff to donate to or spend on behalf of their bosses’ campaigns – and the House Ethics Manual prohibits them from doing so even if they expect to be reimbursed. [18 U.S.C. § 603, House Ethics Manual p. 139]
- But Schweikert engaged in an “unprecedented” scheme in which his Chief of Staff spent nearly $300,000 out-of-pocket on behalf of Schweikert’s campaign and was later reimbursed. (pp. 41-51)
- These expenditures and reimbursements appeared to be strategically timed to boost Schweikert’s campaign’s reported cash on hand – forcing his Chief to wait months for reimbursement. (pp. 45, 52)
- Schweikert misreported his staff as consulting payments or payments to credit card companies in an apparent effort to hide his reimbursement scheme. (pp. 9-10)
- Schwab claimed he billed the campaign for consulting fees when he was actually seeking reimbursement for paying for Schweikert’s private jet travel out of pocket. (p. 43)
- Schweikert’s Chief claimed Schweikert urged him to “avoid a paper trail” and to disguise unflattering expenses at fancy DC restaurants. (p. 42)

Schweikert Failed to Disclose Thousands More in Campaign Money – Including a Made Up Loan That Boosted His Cash on Hand Numbers

- Schweikert appeared to falsely report a $100,000 personal loan that did not actually exist to boost his campaign’s cash on hand – then reported a series of fictional direct mail expenses to balance the books. Schweikert appeared to have been aware about the fictional loan and appeared to willfully hide it from the Ethics Committee. (pp. 20-27)
- Schweikert had thousands of other improperly disclosed loans, disbursements, and donations. (pp. 8-11)

Schweikert Used Official Resources to Benefit of His Campaign

- Schweikert used official resources to benefit his campaign. (pp. 61-71)
- Schwab felt “pressured by Rep. Schweikert to fundraise on behalf of his campaign” and said he was expected to prioritize campaign work over official work. Schwab was Schweikert’s primary fundraiser for much of his tenure as COS. Staff were pressured to fundraiser for Schweikert’s campaign. When one staff member was up for a pay raise in the official office, Schwab noted that he was not impressed by her fundraising performance for the campaign. A separate employee testified that in fall 2016, Schwab informed him that in order to stay employed in the
official office, he needed to take a 40% pay cut and “his performance would be judged on fundraising” for the campaign. (pp. 60, 77)

- Schweikert and his staff did campaign work within his House office, including meeting with a pollster, printing campaign materials, and working on organizing campaign fundraisers. (pp. 62-63)
- Schweikert was overheard saying, “we don’t want any paper trails of emails floating around about a pollster.” (p. 67)

**Schweikert Used Taxpayer Dollars for Other Impermissible Purposes**

- Schweikert made “little to no effort to oversee the use of official resources in his office.” (p. 60)
- Schweikert’s office spent $6,000 to send his Chief of Staff to Phoenix for the Super Bowl. (pp. 80-82)
- While it was not cited specifically as an improper purchased, staff testified that they questioned the expenses of certain purchases made by Schwab, including a Dyson air fan that “cost hundreds of dollars” and an “unnecessary” electronic heating unit. (p. 85)

**Schweikert Left Key Information Off of His Personal Financial Disclosures**

- Schweikert omitted key information on his financial disclosure statements from 2010 to 2017, including failing to disclose rental properties and purchases and liabilities associated with those properties, discrepancies in real estate income between what he reported on his tax returns and PFDs, and omitting bank accounts and certain credit card liabilities. (pp. 91-92)

**Schweikert Misled and Stalled Investigators**

- Schweikert was separately penalized for his “lack of candor and diligence” regarding the investigation. (pp. 94-95)
- The committee reported that while Schweikert initially expressed his intention to cooperate and submitted written answers and produced “thousands” of documents in response to requests for information, “the ISC did not believe that Rep. Schweikert treated the allegations of misconduct raised by OCE’s referral with sufficient seriousness. His actions instead suggested that he was more concerned with bringing the matter to a close as quickly as possible, while not inclined to actually familiarize himself with all of the allegations or take proactive steps to remedy prior FEC reporting errors.” (p. 94)
- Schweikert denied allegations that turned out to be true, including that members of his congressional staff ever babysat his child in the office, paid for babysitters on his behalf, took his clothes to be dry cleaned, or were stuck with a bill for a staff dinner after Representative Schweikert left the restaurant without paying. (p. 95)

**Schweikert Plotted to Primary Jeff Flake, Increasing Fundraising Pressure In His Office**

- Schweikert repeatedly expressed interest in running for Senate. A staffer testified that in the fall of 2016, Schweikert said he wanted to raise enough money to be able to challenge then-Sen. Jeff Flake in 2018. Schweikert put heavy pressure on Schwab to raise a million dollars for this purpose, including to leave the office to fundraise. (pp. 74, 102)
• “Moreover, his testimony before the ISC, which was interspersed with incoherent or misleading statements that were contradicted by the record, fell well short of the duty of candor Members are expected to provide.” (p. 2)

• “With respect to the views Representative Schweikert submitted in response to the ISC’s Report, the ISC does not believe they are in clear contravention of the agreed upon terms of the settlement in this matter, but they raise questions about whether he has truly accepted responsibility for his actions or whether he appreciates that the violations in this matter stemmed from his own conduct and inaction.” (p. 2)

• “This led to a dynamic in which Representative Schweikert’s campaign and congressional staff felt dissuaded from raising concerns about Mr. Schwab; those staff who did raise concerns about Mr. Schwab found Representative Schweikert to be dismissive and unwilling to take any meaningful action.” (p. 7)

• “Indeed, if the ISC relied upon the uncorroborated portions of Mr. Schwab’s testimony to make its findings, its analysis of this matter would be very different and Representative Schweikert would be facing harsher penalties for his conduct.” (p. 7)

• “The misconduct reviewed by the ISC was wide-ranging and long-spanning, and when viewed in the aggregate, a clear pattern of indifference emerges. Representative Schweikert was indifferent to ensuring the offices he oversaw complied with applicable laws and other standards of conduct. He was indifferent to taking corrective actions after learning of reporting errors or ongoing campaign violations and unresponsive to campaign and official staff members’ concerns about Mr. Schwab’s conduct. The ISC’s investigation was treated with similar indifference; Representative Schweikert delayed responding to its requests and his testimony was punctuated by dissembling and incoherent statements.” (p. 8)

• “The ISC’s investigation was treated with similar indifference; Representative Schweikert delayed responding to its requests and his testimony was punctuated by dissembling and incoherent statements.” (p. 8)

• “However, Representative Schweikert insisted publicly that the allegations referred by OCE related to ‘clerical mistakes’ while neglecting requests from the ISC for over a year to identify those mistakes and the steps taken to address those mistakes.” (p. 9)

• The ISC found that Schweikert’s misconduct was “profound and pervasive.” (p. 98)

FINDINGS RELATING TO CAMPAIGN FINANCE

• Finds that “From at least July 2010 through at least December 2017, Representative Schweikert and/or his campaign committees routinely violated federal campaign finance laws and regulations.” (p. 9)

• Schweikert failed to correct misreported campaign finance reports for a year after they were flagged by the Office of Congressional Ethics while downplaying the violations publicly. “However, Representative Schweikert insisted publicly that the allegations referred by OCE related to ‘clerical mistakes’ while neglecting requests from the ISC for over a year to identify those mistakes and the steps taken to address those mistakes.” (p. 9)

• The report found that “Representative Schweikert facilitated many of the most egregious errors.” (p. 11)

• The report found that “Schweikert’s failure to take reasonable actions to ensure his campaign committees followed applicable laws led to systemic FECA violations and his indifference to
many of these issues continued even after they were summarized in great detail by the OCE.” (p. 11)

MISUSE OF CAMPAIGN FUNDS FOR PERSONAL EXPENDITURES

- It is illegal for members of Congress to use campaign funds for “personal use” and to accept gifts from their staff without reimbursing them. (pp. 57-58)
- Though Schweikert never received gifts from staff without providing reimbursement, his campaign often paid for those reimbursements. This is impermissible. (p. 58)
- There were “numerous instances” in which former Chief of Staff Oliver Schwab and other House staff regularly made purchases for Schweikert’s personal use – including meals, travel, drycleaning, and babysitting. (p. 58)
- Schweikert used campaign funds to reimburse staff for purchases made for his personal use. (pp. 53-56)
- Schwab was reimbursed by the campaign for buying meals for Schweikert in DC. (p. 53)
- Schweikert reimbursed a staffer $800 with campaign funds for paying out of her own pocket for babysitting for Schweikert’s daughter. Schweikert’s campaign reported the reimbursement as a “consulting” payment. (pp. 55-56)
- Schweikert had Congressional staff babysit his daughter in his House Office. (p. 56)
- An email revealed that Schweikert sought to hire an “unemployed female intern type person” to his House office to serve as a taxpayer-funded babysitter for his daughter. (p. 56)
- Schwab and another staffer paid for Schweikert’s dry cleaning and were reimbursed by Schweikert’s campaign. (p. 54)
- Schwab claimed that Schweikert asked him to purchase flights for Schweikert and his family using his own frequent flier miles and he did so. (pp. 54-55)
- Schwab claimed Schweikert encouraged him to “be creative” and bill the campaign for the Congressman’s personal expenses. (p. 59)

IMPERMISSIBLE CONTRIBUTIONS FROM CHIEF OF STAFF OLIVER SCHWAB AND OTHER CONGRESSIONAL STAFF

- Congressional staff are not allowed to contribute to their employers’ campaigns.
- Schweikert’s campaign engaged in “sustained and significant violations” of the prohibition on donations from staff. [18 U.S.C. § 603]
- The ISC found that even if Schweikert was unaware of the donations, which seems somewhat unlikely, that “Schweikert’s utter indifference to his campaign’s financial transactions was a gross neglect of his responsibility as a congressional candidate and House Member.” (p. 52)
- Schweikert received impermissible donations from five staffers. (p. 40)
- Two of Schweikert’s staffers, including former Chief Oliver Schwab, had donated cash directly to his campaign. One of these donations was later refunded and the other was reattributed to the staff’s spouse. (pp. 40-41)
- Oliver Schwab claimed Schweikert had asked him directly to donate to his campaign. Schweikert denied this allegation. (p. 40)
- Schweikert had his Chief of make expenditures on behalf of his campaign totaling over $270,000 – that his campaign could otherwise not afford – and would reimburse him weeks or months later. (pp. 41-43)
• REMEMBER: It’s always illegal for House staff to make expenditures on behalf of their boss—even if they expect to be reimbursed later. [House Ethics Manual p. 139]

• Schweikert hid the extent to which his Chief of Staff Oliver Schwab was funding his campaign by reporting reimbursements to Schwab as consulting fees to Schwab’s consulting company and as payments to Schwab’s credit card companies. (pp. 10, 41-44)

• Schwab claimed Schweikert was aware Schwab was making expenditures on behalf of the campaign and that Schweikert encouraged him to seek reimbursement through his consulting firm. (pp. 41-44)

• Schwab claimed he billed Schweikert’s campaign for consulting fees when he was actually seeking reimbursement for paying for Schweikert’s airfare on a private jet. (pp. 43-44)

• Schweikert at first denied he was aware that Schwab was making expenditures on behalf of this campaign but later admitted that he may have been aware of the outlays. (p. 42)

• Other witnesses, including Schweikert’s campaign consultants, claimed Schweikert was aware of the payments by Schwab. (p. 43)

• Schwab claimed Schweikert had him disguise reimbursements as consulting payments to hide dinners out in DC. Schweikert denied this allegation. (p. 42)

• Schwab claimed Schweikert had explicitly instructed him “if you can avoid a paper trail all the better” regarding his outlays on behalf of the campaign. (p. 42)

• The payments by Schwab “enabled Representative Schweikert’s campaign to inflate quarterly financial figures” and to make campaign expenditures it “would not otherwise have had the liquidity to make.” Schwab would often delay reimbursement for months at a time, allowing the campaign to report stronger numbers. (pp. 9-10)

• Schwab claimed Schweikert directly asked him to wait to be reimbursed to pump up the campaign’s reported cash on hand. Other Schweikert staff reported hearing Schwab claim that Schweikert owed him money. (p. 53)

• Schweikert denied that he was aware of Schwab’s reimbursements or that he was delaying payment, but other staffers argued this claim was not credible since Schweikert closely monitored the campaign’s finances. (p. 47)

• In 2014 or 2015, concerns about the reimbursements were brought to Schweikert, but he did not take action to correct them. (p. 51)

• The ISC called Schweikert’s reimbursement scheme “unprecedented.” (p. 51)

• The subcommittee found Schweikert engaged in “a broader effort to obscure the extent of Mr. Schwab’s advances and inflate the campaign’s quarterly financial numbers.” (p. 45)

• The subcommittee found the reimbursements raised “serious transparency concerns” and that the failure to adequately report the campaign’s debts to Schwab was part of “an overall systemic pattern of misconduct.” (p. 52)

---

**FALSELY REPORTED PERSONAL LOAN**

• In 2012, Schweikert reported that he had loaned his campaign $100,000 but no such loan had actually been made. (pp. 20-27)

• The falsely reported loan inflated Schweikert’s cash on hand total. (p. 22)

• Schweikert reported five false expenditures totaling $100,000 to a consultant that did not actually exist to reconcile his report and his accounts. (p. 22)
In 2012, Schweikert’s 2012 campaign manager told former Chief of Staff Oliver Schwab that Schweikert’s wife had stolen from the campaign accounts – but maintained that he was joking during the investigation. (pp. 22-23)

Even though Schweikert was aware the loan did not exist, in 2013, he claimed he had forgiven fictional the loan. (pp. 25, 29-30)

For a year after the OCE informed Schweikert about irregularities with the loan in 2018, Schweikert took no action to correct FEC records. (p. 30)

The ISC found Schweikert’s claim the fictional reported loan was an error were not credible. (p. 30)

Schweikert made “no meaningful efforts” to correct the report of the “fictional $100,000 loan.” (p. 29)

The fictional loan “advantaged Representative Schweikert’s campaign by giving the impression that it was in stronger financial shape going into a competitive primary election season.” (pp. 29-30)

The ISC found “at the very least, Schweikert exercised gross indifference” with regard of the fictional loan. (p. 30)

The fictional loan violated federal law, FEC regulations, and House ethics rules. (p. 30)

Schweikert, his wife, and his business (Sheridan Equities LLC) took out a line of credit from Metro Phoenix Bank that Schweikert used to fund in-kind donations to his campaign – and then disclosed those donations as coming from his own personal funds. (pp. 11-16)

Schweikert did not report the loan, his payments with it, or his repayments on it to the FEC even though he was required to do so. (pp. 11-16)

Schweikert did not comply with OCE requests for information regarding the loan and did not comply with the OCE’s advice that he should amend his FEC reports to show the loan. (pp. 18-19)

“Schweikert did not act take appropriate corrective steps to address the reporting omission.” (p. 18)

This non-disclosure violated federal law, FEC regulations, and House Ethics rules. (p. 19)

Schweikert’s wife ignored requests from a subsequent campaign treasurer to give them access to the campaign’s bank accounts. (pp. 23-24)

In 2012, Schweikert personally loaned his campaign $130,000 over four separate transfers. Before making the loan, Chabot had received a $100,000 “gift” from a relative. (pp. 30-32)

The circumstances around the loan “raised questions as to whether it was truly sourced from ‘personal funds’ of Representative Schweikert,” since it was illegal to give a candidate a gift of cash with the intention for them to use it to fund their campaign. (p. 34)

The ISC did not conclude the loan was an excessive contribution. (p. 35)
• Between 2010 and 2013, Chabot failed to report thousands in campaign donations and expenditures. (pp. 36-38)
• The ISC found these undisclosed transactions were part of “an overall pattern of systemic reporting violations that Representative Schweikert did not take reasonable steps to prevent or correct.” (p. 39)
• The ISC found failure to disclose expenses “was part of a broader pattern of conduct that did not reflect creditably on the House and violated House Rule XXIII, clause 1.” (p. 39)

FINDINGS RELATING TO MISUSE OF OFFICIAL RESOURCES

• Finds that “between 2011 and 2018, Representative Schweikert’s official resources were misused to support his campaign.” “Many of the instances of misuse of official resources that occurred in Representative Schweikert’s office were textbook examples of prohibited conduct.” Additionally, “Representative Schweikert participated directly in some instances of the misuse.” (pp. 60, 72)

CAMPAIGN WORK IN OFFICIAL OFFICE

• Schwab felt “pressured by Representative Schweikert to fundraise on behalf of his campaign” and said he was expected to prioritize campaign work over official work. Schwab was Schweikert’s primary fundraiser for much of his tenure as COS. (p. 60)
  o Other staff “generally” did not feel that same pressure from Schweikert directly, but felt “there was an expectation to assist the campaign as a result of” the pressure on Schwab. (p. 60)
    ▪ When one staff member was up for a pay raise in the official office, Schwab noted that he was not impressed by her fundraising performance for the campaign (p. 75)
    ▪ A separate employee testified that in fall 2016, Schwab informed him that in order to stay employed in the official office, he needed to take a 40% pay cut and “his performance would be judged on fundraising” for the campaign (p. 76, 78)
    ▪ Another employee testified that they felt as if a lack of engagement in fundraising activities would have affected the potential for a promotion or pay raise (p. 76)
  o Schwab, four other official staff members, AND Schweikert all engaged in campaign work within the Congressional office (pp. 62-68)
  o Schweikert met with his pollster within his Congressional office on 2/27/14, and was overhead saying “we don’t want any paper trails of emails floating around about a pollster.” (p. 67)
  o Schweikert testified he was not aware of Schwab’s performance of campaign work within his office, but another staffer testified that it would have taken “willful ignorance and negligence” for Schweikert to be unaware (p. 72)
  o Schwab engaged in the following campaign activities within the Congressional office: (pp. 62-63)
    ▪ Meeting with a pollster
    ▪ Stuffing and stamping campaign mailers
    ▪ Drafting and responding to campaign communications
    ▪ “Regularly” using the office scanner to print and send campaign documents
- Taking campaign calls and using his Congressional phone for campaign purposes
- Having Congressional staff edit and proof campaign materials
  - Schwab performed this work in the Congressional office in part Schweikert was “very frugal” and refused to have a significant campaign staff, instead pushing lots of work on Schwab (p. 63)
  - Schweikert’s office kept no formal records of when Schwab was working on official versus unofficial business, despite having written policies for tracking leave (p. 64)
  - One official staffer compiled a document on Schweikert’s policy positions on Israel to send to the host of a fundraiser for Schweikert’s campaign, and also wrote part of a campaign newsletter on official time (p. 65)
  - Another staffer sent fundraising requests and posted on Schweikert’s campaign social media pages from within the office (p. 65)
  - A third staffer sent fundraising invitations from within the office (pp. 65-66)

### OFFICIAL FUNDS USED FOR IMPROPER EXPENSES

- Schweikert made “little to no effort to oversee the use of official resources in his office.” (p. 60)
  - “The use of Representative Schweikert’s MRA for unofficial purposes was not an isolated occurrence, but part of a long-running practice that ultimately benefited Representative Schweikert’s campaign at taxpayer’s expense” (p. 61)
  - While much of this misuse was due to Schwab, Schweikert himself “facilitated the use of resources for campaign purposes by pressuring Mr. Schwab to perform campaign work, while at the same time failing to set appropriate boundaries over Mr. Schwab’s performance of official versus campaign work.” (p. 61)

- MRA was used to “improperly” fund roughly $6,000 in expenses for Schwab’s trip to Phoenix from January 28 to February 2, 2015, including five nights of lodging for $4,027.07. (p. 60, 80-82)
  - The trip included some official work, but “the primary purpose for going to Phoenix... was not officially-connected” (pp. 80-81)
  - Schwab testified that he “always intended” to be in Phoenix at that time so he could be there for a Schweikert fundraiser at the Phoenix Open golf tournament (p. 81)
  - Schwab testified that he did NOT attend the Super Bowl (previous news coverage had reported he had), although he did purchase tickets for family members (p. 82)
  - Schwab did attend a political event for Schweikert with the Majority Leader, a theater production with his wife, and meals with his mother, brother, and wife (pp. 80-82)
  - Schwab repaid $5,068 in expenses after his trip was publicized in June 2018 (p. 82)
  - Schweikert testified that he had “no idea” what the purpose of Schwab’s trip was, and the ISC found that this misuse of resources was due to Schweikert’s “failure to adequately supervise staff.” (p. 82-84)

- While it was not cited specifically as an improper purchased, staff testified that they questioned the expenses of certain purchases made by Schwab, including a Dyson air fan that “cost hundreds of dollars” and an “unnecessary” electronic heating unit (p. 85)

- The committee did NOT find substantial reason to believe that allegations surrounding a misuse of official resources for a training class, office purchases, and a severance payment violated House rules. (p. 60, p. 90)
### Omissions on Financial Disclosure Statements

- Schweikert omitted key information on his financial disclosure statements from 2010 to 2017, including failing to disclose rental properties and purchases and liabilities associated with those properties, discrepancies in real estate income between what he reported on his tax returns and PFDs, and omitting bank accounts and certain credit card liabilities. (pp. 91-93)
  - Schweikert said that these discrepancies came about because he had copied data from year to year without updating it. (p. 92)
  - Schweikert amended his PFDs in September 2019 after the ISC subpoenaed his compliance firm (pp. 92-93)

### “Lack of Candor and Diligence”

- The committee reported that while Schweikert initially expressed his intention to cooperate and submitted written answers and produced “thousands” of documents in response to requests for information, “the ISC did not believe that Rep. Schweikert treated the allegations of misconduct raised by OCE’s referral with sufficient seriousness. His actions instead suggested that he was more concerned with bringing the matter to a close as quickly as possible, while not inclined to actually familiarize himself with all of the allegations or take proactive steps to remedy prior FEC reporting errors.” (p. 94)
  - The ISC reported that “some of Rep. Schweikert’s responses to OCE’s requests for information were misleading. Rather than produce documents, he directed the OCE to FEC reports even though the information within the reports was inaccurate, as he knew or had reason to know.” (p. 94)
  - After being asked about potential FEC reporting errors by the Ethics Committee, he drew out the clock and did not advise the FEC or correct those errors until January 2020, which came outside of the five-year statute of limitations for FEC action in response to them. Schweikert claimed to the FEC that the violations were discovered “in the course of the ongoing Congressional investigation,” making it seem as if they were just discovered, when they had rather been raised previously by the Ethics Committee. The ISC wrote that “Schweikert’s own dilatory response ensured the statute of limitations had passed.” (p. 94)
  - Schweikert produced more than 16,000 pages of documents, but did not do so for over a year. ISC noted that Schweikert’s delays went “beyond what is reasonable” for efforts to compile such material. (pp. 94-95)
  - When the ISC interviewed Schweikert, he was unprepared. “During some parts of his testimony, he appeared to be completely unfamiliar with some of the reporting allegations, and at other times he made statements that could not be reconciled with the evidence.” (p. 95)
    - On one occasion, when asked whether Congressional staff bought him food and were reimbursed with taxpayer dollars, Schweikert claimed that he had “never, ever requested reimbursement” and suggested he was not “money-oriented.” However, “the ISC obtained testimony from multiple staff members that Representative Schweikert was, in fact, money conscious, and it obtained records showing that he sought reimbursements, including a reimbursement for over $20,000 in home security expenses from his campaign.” (p. 95)
  - Schweikert also denied that members of his congressional staff ever babysat his child in the office, paid for babysitters on his behalf, took his clothes to be dry cleaned, or were
stuck with a bill for a staff dinner after Representative Schweikert left the restaurant without paying. However, as the ISC reported, “this conduct did occur.” (p. 95)

- The ISC summarized the issue:
  
  “The ISC found Representative Schweikert’s conduct during its investigation troubling. He did not always provide candid responses to the ISC’s questions, and he made repeated assurances that he had taken steps to correct reporting errors, when in fact he had not, and then appeared to be unfamiliar with some of those errors when he was asked about them during his testimony. The ISC was struck by how little Representative Schweikert seemed to appreciate the severity of the allegations raised in OCE’s Second Referral in particular.” (p. 96)

- Schweikert attempted to blame the ISC’s questioning strategy for these discrepancies, however: “many of Representative Schweikert’s statements were not in response to any questions posed by ISC counsel but his own affirmative attempts to get ahead of the evidence by making blanket statements that were not entirely forthright... All the ISC sought was honest and candid testimony from Representative Schweikert, and if he did not recall or know the answer to a question posed, he was free to state that he did not recall or did not know. Rather than do that, however, he sought, proactively, to portray himself in a light that was not supported by the evidence and now attempts to blame the ISC for his own problematic testimony” (pp. 96-97)

- At the same time, however, the ISC “did not find that Representative Schweikert actively intended to lie or mislead the ISC or obstruct its investigation.” (p. 97)

**HOUSE-LEVEL SANCTION**

- The ISC found that in instances where misconduct is “profound and pervasive,” a committee-level reproval is insufficient and a House-level sanction is required. The committee determined that this misconduct meets that standard. (p. 98)
  
  “While the ISC did not find evidence indicating that Representative Schweikert was aware of the full extent of the misconduct, it would not be fair to characterize the sum of the violations as merely unintentional or inadvertent. Moreover, while Representative Schweikert did fail to exercise adequate supervision, the larger picture was one of something more than mere mismanagement or inattention. The ISC found that Representative Schweikert’s conduct was, at best, a product of willful ignorance and an abdication of responsibility.” (p. 99)

**ADDITIONAL ODDS AND ENDS**

- Schweikert often slept in his office, which is technically against House rules (p. 67)

- Schweikert repeatedly expressed interest in running for Senate. A staffer testified that in the fall of 2016, Schweikert said he wanted to raise enough money to be able to challenge then-Sen. Jeff Flake in 2018. Schweikert put heavy pressure on Schwab to raise a million dollars for this purpose, including to leave the office to fundraise. (p. 74)
  
  “Schweikert denied that he pressured Schwab to fundraise for him on office time. (pp. 74-75)