

MINUTES
HOUSE ETHICS AND HOUSE POLICY COMMITTEE

DATE: Thursday, April 29, 2021
TIME: 10:00 A.M.
PLACE: Room WW 02
MEMBERS: Chairman Dixon, Representatives Horman, Crane, Gannon, McCrostie
**ABSENT/
EXCUSED:** None
GUESTS: Bill Myers, Holland & Hart, LLC; Rep. von Ehlinger, Edward Dindinger, Dindinger & Kohler, PLLC

Per Joint Rule 19, these minutes have been prepared in summary fashion. They are not a verbatim transcription of the proceedings on April 29, 2021.

Chairman Dixon called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m.

Bill Myers, Holland & Hart, LLP, provided to the Committee and for the benefit of the other members of the chamber and the public the parameters of the Committee's decision space in the complaint they received. He said the authority for the Committee arises from two sources, the first is Article III, Section 11 of the Idaho Constitution. The other authority that the Committee has is Rule 45 of the Idaho House of Representatives Rules. Rule 45(4), specifically addresses what the Committee can do in response to the complaint received under Rule 45. Mr. Myers said in addition, a third authority is Mason's Manual of Legislative Procedure, which is incorporated by reference through House Rule 75 wherever it is not inconsistent with existing House Rules. He explained under Rule 45(5), there are basically three options pending before the Committee. If they vote by four-fifths vote, they can dismiss the complaint; they can issue a reprimand; or they can issue a censure, and that censure can be with or without restrictions and conditions.

Chairman Dixon opened the Committee for deliberation.

Rep. McCrostie said the Ethics Committee is charged with determining whether **Rep. von Ehlinger** engaged in conduct unbecoming a Representative which is detrimental to the integrity of the House as a legislative body by a standard of clear and convincing evidence. Clear and convincing indicates that it is highly probable that the conduct occurred, and as a Committee, must either find clear and convincing evidence or must dismiss the complaint.

He said the facts here are incontrovertible. The Representative, an elected state Representative, engaged in a sexual relationship with a student intern. The court system can determine if rape occurred, but there is no doubt that this relationship was inappropriate. He said he is not persuaded by the repetition of whether a specific policy exists. Common sense and basic morality dictates that an elected Representative should not entertain a relationship with a student intern, regardless of who initiated the relationship.

Rep. McCrostie said, moreover, the Committee has heard with similar repetition how the Representative should have known better. In his short tenure in the Idaho Legislature, he was spoken to twice by **Rep. Holtzclaw** on monitoring his conduct, and over the course of two months he attended two legislative trainings on a respectful workplace; and yet in that amount of time, he has pursued four different women with ties not just to the legislature, but actually limited to the Idaho House. This pattern of behavior, on not only ignoring counsel on appropriate workplace boundaries, but also pursuing relationships, including sexual relationships in the House.

Rep. McCrostie said he is also un-persuaded on the selective use of three separate polygraph tests. The Representative appeared before this Committee three times, including yesterday's public hearing, where he had an opportunity to clear up any prior testimony. Rather than clear his name, he chose to hide behind his selective polygraph questions. Neither the Committee nor the complainant's attorney were able to select questions for the Representative's polygraph tests, so these polygraph tests hold less weight and less credibility. Further, upon review of the limited questions included in the polygraph tests, any test results are of little relevance in his determination of conduct unbecoming.

The Representative's aggressive tactics towards women are unsettling. **Rep. McCrostie** said he feels horrible that **Jane Doe** was in the situation she was in and is now in the situation she is now in. He said he applauds her bravery in sharing her truth with **Kim Blackburn** and appreciate Ms. Blackburn's professionalism in moving Ms. Doe's story through the proper channels. He applauds her bravery in sharing her incident with **Rep. Christensen** and grateful that he offered her sound counsel to follow through with the criminal investigation. And he applauds her bravery in sharing her testimony with this Committee and in particular at yesterday's hearing. Sexual assault survivors are seldom subjected to having their testimony publicly broadcast, but she knew that her truth may enable others to not suffer as she has.

Rep. McCrostie continued saying along those lines, how **Jane Doe** was treated by some members of yesterday's audience is abhorrent. Those who engaged in that mistreatment yesterday should be ashamed of themselves. As an aside, here's another rule that's not part of Idaho Code, policy, or administrative rule, but maybe it should be. It's the Golden Rule. Do unto others as you would have them do unto you. If there's any other higher standard that House members should be held to, the Golden Rule is a good place to start. We owe it to Jane Doe and to future Jane Does to ensure that the Idaho House can conduct our business with integrity. The Legislative work environment must be safe for legislators, staff, interns, pages, lobbyists, legislative employees, legislative partners, credentialed members of the press, guests testifying before Committee, and visitors to our Capitol.

Rep. McCrostie said the incident that initiated the ethics complaint, the Ethics Committee investigation, and the ethics hearing has revealed the House to be unsafe. The body's integrity is damaged, and the charge of the Committee is to repair that. Therefore, for the aforementioned reasons, he found the Representative has engaged in conduct unbecoming a Representative which is detrimental to the integrity of the House as a legislative body.

Rep. Horman spoke next stating she would like to state a point about this investigation by the Ethics Committee, the business of the Committee and the House is the Representative's integrity before this Committee and a pattern of behavior with subordinates in the workplace, whether there was a formal rule about it or not, and whether that constitutes conduct unbecoming that is detrimental to the integrity of the Idaho House of Representatives. She said this is a trust that none of the Committee members has undertaken lightly, but was considered with the utmost diligence and gravity. The Representative was told that in an interview with the Committee. It is the entirety of the actions and how that reflects upon the body.

She said she would like to make three points: First, the Representative refused to testify in a public hearing on certain aspects of his behavior, second, he misled the Ethics Committee; and third, she said she believes he has engaged in conduct unbecoming that is detrimental to the integrity of the House.

First, refusing to testify. One purpose of yesterday's hearing was to provide all House members evidence, as much evidence as possible, upon which they could make their decision. It is the Idaho House of Representatives that will ultimately make the decision on the outcome of this proceeding. This Committee has spent many, many hours investigating the facts of this case. The Committee's colleagues in the House do not yet have that same benefit. By pleading the Fifth and refusing to answer questions for the benefit of his colleagues who ultimately will make the decision on the outcome of this proceeding, it shows tremendous disrespect for those colleagues who also want to make a fair decision based on the facts of the case. Some people may have rushed to judgment on this matter without the benefit of the facts, facts that came out in the preliminary confidential portion of the investigation, facts that came out following the release of the evidence for public records request, and additional new facts that came forward yesterday. By refusing to testify to pertinent facts, the House was denied the opportunity to hear the full story from the Representative's perspective.

Second, misleading the Committee. **Rep. Horman** said multiple inconsistencies were identified during testimony. Things such as statements from the transcript, that he would not be moving forward with trying to have any further relationship with this person, to texts later that say the opposite.

Third, conduct unbecoming. **Rep. Horman** said through hours of interviews and investigation into the original complaint, the Committee has established that the Representative has a pattern of dating, attempted dating, and sexual relationships with subordinates in the Capitol, and concerns serious enough from a lobbyist that she spoke with a member of House Leadership about it. Yet, the testimony before the Committee was, quote: "I'll admit I don't date a lot, and when I do, I try to make sure it's someone I have a connection with. I'm not a person that goes out on a date every week or anything like that." Rep. Horman said, yet, there are two witnesses before this Committee that testified under oath that in early March, after a handful of inconsequential or non-substantive conversations, he initiated two dates with women he'd only recently met which led to sexual activity. The Representative concedes he was specifically warned against such behavior on multiple occasions, starting with the training, where he acknowledged in the preliminary phase of this investigation that he remembered from freshman orientation that hugging in the workplace was not a good idea. He was subsequently warned by two Representatives that had his best interest in mind, and those of the House of Representatives, to help him learn what he should not need a written rule to know, that the elected position carries with it certain elements of power and status, not to mention trust, having wisdom and good judgment. She said they were trying to help him, as stated yesterday, avoid anguish going forward. Quote: "Don't be overly nice with anyone. You don't want to have anyone misconstrue what you're doing if you're flirting with them. Be pleasant but not overly nice because you're

single. I owed it to him as a human being to speak candidly." Quote: "Look, you can't talk to anyone in a flirty manner. You cannot date anyone, ask out anyone, be with anyone. This place is off limits to you. No more. You can't do it." The Representative was told that in a kind way, that because you're single, if you would like to go to the movies with a young lady, someone in this building, but because of the position you're in, it could weigh more heavily in her decision than if you were equally yoked. Which was later clarified before the Committee to mean peers or other elected representatives holding the same position.

Rep. Horman said other Representatives testified under oath yesterday that they understood that a custom of dating a staffer is unacceptable in this building. When questioned, the Representative's interpretation of the counsel he was offered by a fellow Representative was that he needed to be on his best behavior. When questioned yesterday about what best behavior was, the Committee was told it means you should be extra careful to follow the law. He said he had listened to that counsel and agreed, made a mental note that "Some things could be considered possibly flirtatious and I needed to be extra vigilant with anything like that."

She went on to say the Representative admits and acknowledges that he was warned multiple times against hugging in the workplace, against flirtatious behavior, even against any kind of behavior that was simply polite but that could be misconstrued. It appears the Representative doesn't appear to consider sexual relations with subordinates to be in any of those categories. She said there is no House Rule against poisoning another person, yet his behavior has poisoned the reputation of all of us and tarnished and discredited other elected officials who serve. "Conduct unbecoming" is an undefined term for a reason, per our rules. Each Representative in the House of Representatives will evaluate the facts of the case and agree or disagree whether the behavior constitutes conduct unbecoming detrimental to the integrity of the House. This body will now define it by the Committee's actions, and will further define it by any consequences associated with such behavior.

Rep. Gannon stated this has been a tough experience for everyone. This legislature is a political body, but it is a legislature in the United States of America, not Russia, and that means, he hoped people understand that the accused has rights and that the law should apply as much as possible. He said he hoped that is what the Committee has tried to do with the hearing. But for those who work and serve as interns in the legislature, they have rights and expectations too. They have a right to have a respectful, helpful workplace and a safe workplace for them and a good, positive experience.

Rep. Gannon said the issue is conduct unbecoming, and there is no rule in place directly dealing with sexual harassment, that is correct. He said therefore, under Mason's rule 4.2, it speaks to custom, usage, and precedents in order to determine what the rule is in the House. Mason's 4.2 lists states as follows: Rules of legislative procedure are derived from several sources and take precedence in the order listed below. Principal sources are as follows: A, constitutional provisions and judicial decisions thereon; B, adopted rules; C, custom, usage, and precedence; D, statutory provisions.

Rep. Gannon said he looked at customs, usage, and precedents in order to determine what the standard is for the House of Representatives from a legal perspective and not so much from an emotional perspective. He said **Rep. Holtzclaw** described how there is a difference in authority and power between a Legislator and staff. He said twelve-year legislator, defense witness, **Rep. Barbieri** said he had never heard of a legislator dating an intern. Respondent witness and staff member **Erica McGinnis** said she had never been asked out by any other legislator. **Rep. Gannon** went on to say, uniform and commercial justice gives an idea of what the term "usage" is, and it defines conduct unbecoming as including strict rules against dating.

He said finders of facts must consider evidence, and he would have liked more evidence about sexual harassment policies, in general, from Boise businesses, and other public entities. He said it is a known fact, private companies regularly fire employees who troll female workers or make unwanted sexual advances, whether there is a policy or not. He said so the custom at the legislature appears to be, and would say definitely is, no dating with interns and probably no dating with staff either.

Rep. Gannon said the usage of conduct unbecoming is well-settled in military context. The precedent in the legislature that happened a couple years ago was something you did not do as a legislator. There is custom, there is usage, and precedent, he said in his view that is enough to find that there is conduct unbecoming.

He said the next question is: how culpable is this violation? The first issue he was told by **Rep. Holtzclaw** not to date women from the Capitol. **Rep. Blanksma** told him that his actions with a female lobbyist, whether intentional or not, were of concern. The Representative's actions with the Journal Clerk were rebuffed. **Rep. Gannon** said the Representative is 38 years old and is very aware of the military's fraternization policy. He's worked for a large county in Arizona and other places. He's intelligent and successfully completed a degree at the University of Alabama. **Rep. Gannon** said he would have to conclude that he was well-familiar with custom, usage, and precedent, and that dating interns would violate the legislature's policy. **Rep. Gannon** went on to say the Representative was made aware of these policies prior to pursuing **Ms. Doe** and the Capitol Mall security guard. He said the culpability involves consideration of the difference in power between the Representative and the intern, and that power differential is clear from the evidence and really from common sense. What are the age, maturity, and experience differences between the parties? There is a significant difference in age between the parties and an even more significant difference in experience. And there is no comparable experience for a 19-year-old unpaid student intern, to the maturity and experience of the other party. The security guard presumably has some minimal training, but is still pursuing her education and wants to be a police officer someday. **Rep. Gannon** said this conduct would cause him to support censure with some conditions.

Rep. Gannon said unfortunately there is more. He said the testimony of the Capitol Mall security guard, which was not denied or refuted in any way, was very compelling to him. It took her tremendous courage to come and testify in front of this crowd, she was visibly nervous and uncomfortable and she described an experience very similar to **Jane Doe's**. Buy a meal, drive to the apartment, and then there was an unpleasant sexual encounter. She did not enjoy seeing the gun collection in the Representative's apartment as she thought she would. And she left employment at the Capitol a few weeks later. Her testimony was very compelling, and it was not refuted.

Rep. Gannon also explained the date with the intern, **Ms. Doe**, was more than unpleasant. It evolved into a nightmare, and there is no dispute concerning the events that led up to the arrival inside the apartment. There is agreement that she was driven to an expensive dinner in a BMW. There was an effort to impress her, and she was driven back to his apartment, instead of to her car. Then there was the sex which is described, and other entities will have to determine, whether the sex was consensual or not.

The fact that there are age differentials, experience, power differentials, leads to serious problems, and this is why workplace liaisons are discouraged. **Rep. Gannon** mentioned one comment regarding the lie detector. He said the lie detector's questions were not selected by the Committee. He said to his knowledge, the Committee didn't even have notice of what questions were being asked, and then when the Committee did have questions or when a Deputy Attorney General had questions, there was a refusal to answer. It is grossly unfair to the process to select the questions to be answered on a polygraph and decline to answer other questions.

Rep. Gannon stated in the end, that this is a little more emotional than the evidence, but consideration must be taken into account of what members would want for their children if they came to the Idaho Legislature to serve as interns. He said he would want a place where children would have had a safe place and positive experience and be treated with respect. That didn't happen in this case, and therefore because of the knowledge and the pattern, he thought there needed to do more than censure.

Rep. Crane thanked the Chairman for giving the Committee time last evening and this morning to contemplate. He said it was very helpful to him personally, having sat through nearly 70 hours of meetings, and testimony. He mentioned he knew the audience here and fellow colleagues only got about 10 percent of that yesterday. He said it was important for him to be able to collect his thoughts, weigh out the testimony that was heard yesterday. Some of that testimony, like the security guard, for the first time.

Rep. Crane said House Rule 45 is very clear. This issue was not about consent. This was simply about conduct unbecoming a Representative which is detrimental to the integrity of the House as a legislative body. He said he focused his research last night on some of those terms that he did not have a clear definitive answer on. Unbecoming. "Unbecoming" is defined as not fitting or appropriate. It's also defined as ill-suited, unacceptable, improper, inappropriate, undignified, indecent, ungentlemanly. "Detrimental" is damaging, harmful, hurtful. "Integrity," the quality of being honest and having strong moral principles, moral uprightness. He said the question that is asked: Is the conduct unbecoming a Representative which is detrimental to the integrity of the House as a legislative body? He said he did not feel that the respondent's counsel yesterday was able to prove that the conduct by **Rep. Aaron von Ehlinger** was becoming to a member of the House of Representatives.

Rep. Crane explained other questions he wrestled with: Did **Rep. von Ehlinger's** actions from August 20, 2020 through April 29, 2021 help or harm the integrity of the House? He said he didn't think there was any actions taken from that time that we heard about in the 70 hours of investigation and evidence that were helpful to the integrity of the House. He said the actions taken by the Representative were extremely detrimental to the integrity of the House.

He said the other question he asked is: Was this an isolated incident or was there a predatory pattern? There was indeed a predatory pattern that was established. In the special session of August 20, 2020, the Representative was warned to be careful. January 22, 2021, he made an attempt to have a date with the Journal Clerk, just one week after having completed Respectful Workplace training. In February he was warned by **Rep. Holtzclaw**, "This building is off limits. You don't date anyone in this building." He wasn't happy about that, so he went to see **Rep. Blanksma**, who further reiterated the point. And yet the clerk that rebuffed his advances in January, was sent a birthday card. **Rep. Crane** said he's served in the legislature for 15 years. He doesn't know how long that clerk has served in this body, but he believed it would be at least six to eight years. He said he doesn't know when her birthday is and that he just found that out yesterday. It's not a common practice that lawmakers do, to send birthday cards to females that we've asked out on a date that have rebuffed us. Rep. Crane said in March, the Representative asked **Jane Doe** out on a date and through the course of this investigation he found out the Representative asked a Capitol Mall security member out on a date.

Rep. Crane said he went back through the two binders, and tried to compile some of the testimony that was heard, some of the questions that were asked, and it was interesting reading back through some of the information and statements that were made to the Committee while we were still in executive session. On April 2, 2021, the Committee received a letter from the Representative's legal counsel that said: At this point, given the bizarre statements by **Ms. Jane Doe** at the end of the night, **Rep. von Ehlinger** knew that he would not pursue a relationship with Ms. Jane Doe. On April 12th, ten days later, he appeared before the Committee, and interestingly enough, there was a text exchange, that took place, between Jane Doe and Rep. von Ehlinger where Rep. von Ehlinger said, "I assure you I didn't. I like you and I had a nice time. I'd like to go out again, if you're interested. Can I call you?" So now to the phone call: "So, I mean" – this is Rep. von Ehlinger speaking. "So, I mean, if that's the way you want it, I'll never bother you again. Yeah. I hope you'll reconsider and – at some time and consider giving me another chance." This is after he had testified very clearly and told the Committee he had no intent of dating this person. This was going to be an isolated event. He had found some things out. But yet the Committee has evidence to the contrary. The Representative had also said to the Committee: "I'll admit I don't date a lot. I'm a rather busy person. When I do, I try to make sure it's someone that I feel like I have a connection with." Rep. Crane said for an individual that doesn't date a lot, the Committee found out in our research that there was four people that he had attempted to go on dates with.

When he appeared before the Committee with his second legal counsel, **Mr. Leroy**, he was interviewed again. And if anyone actually wants to hear the details of what happened on the night that the gentleman pled the Fifth on and would not relay to the entire body, I would suggest that you read that. It is a very graphic – it's very descriptive. At the end of the hearing on April 15th he said to the Committee: "I would just like to express to each and every one of you that a situation like this will never happen again. I promise each and every one of you that this will never happen again. It's all I have to say. I hope you'll accept that and know that I am deeply serious about it. And that's all."

Rep. Crane said its interestingly enough, in that discussion with the Committee and that interview, that's when we found out that there was second individual that he had had a relationship with, the Capitol Mall security guard. What was not revealed in that relationship – and if you read the exchange, there is some questions of – to his truthfulness, as to how truthful he was in revealing that he had had a relationship with her. But it wasn't until yesterday that we learned that that was a sexual relationship. And to find out that the facts in that sexual relationship were almost identical to the facts of the relationship with **Jane Doe**. Go out to dinner, come back to my apartment, and you serve me.

Rep. Crane said he has thought a lot about this. The Idaho House of Representatives existed long before we arrived, and it will be here long after we leave, but history will judge us by the actions today. He said he wants our actions to provide a clear directive to the current and future members of the Idaho House of Representatives that this body expects the members of the Idaho House of Representatives to serve their constituents with the highest ethical and moral manner.

Chairman Dixon stated of what his colleagues have said, he is in agreement with. But what he wanted to touch upon is mainly for his colleagues and the responsibility that comes with the badges that are worn when here, when we take the role and title of Representative and the weight that that carries with it, and it's not something to be dismissed easily. Representatives have a responsibility to those who helped us get elected. There is a responsibility to our district as a whole, even if people didn't vote for us in that. That's still our responsibility. We have a responsibility to this state. We have a responsibility to this institution, to all those that came before us, as **Rep. Crane** said, and those who will come after us. We have a responsibility to uphold a good public perception of this institution, to continue confidence in government, not to undermine that confidence so that people are questioning what happens so that we can have an orderly society.

He said whether we like it or not, in the public eye we are held to a higher standard, and that's a standard we should embrace. It is an honor to gain the trust of your constituency of the people that voted for you, and we need to hold ourselves to a higher standard of conduct. **Chairman Dixon** said in his opinion, there was clearly conduct unbecoming by the Representative in this case. He said by anybody's standards, if you were to ask, "Is it appropriate for a 38-year-old to be dating a 19-year-old," that alone in itself would be questionable, but the fact that there's a title borne with it makes it even more questionable. He stated these actions, in his opinion, are denigrating to the institution. They're undermining the public confidence in government and the work that we have to do as elected officials.

MOTION:

Rep. Horman made a motion that in the matter of **Rep. Aaron von Ehlinger**, following our investigation and hearing held pursuant to House Rule 45, the Committee unanimously finds by clear and convincing evidence that Rep. von Ehlinger engaged in conduct unbecoming a Representative which is detrimental to the integrity of the House as a legislative body. Therefore, we unanimously recommend that the House of Representatives censure Rep. von Ehlinger with the restrictions and conditions that: One, he be immediately suspended without pay or benefits from serving as the Representative for District 6, Seat A, for the remainder of the 66th Idaho Legislature; two, he must immediately vacate his office in the Capitol and not return to the Capitol grounds for the remainder of the 66th Idaho Legislature; and three, a substitute Representative should be appointed with compensation as soon as possible following his suspension to represent District 6, Seat A, for the remainder of the 66th Idaho Legislature. In addition to the Rule 45 sanction, we would unanimously support a procedurally proper motion before the House to expel Rep. von Ehlinger for good cause shown under Article III, Section 11, of the Constitution of the State of Idaho. Further, we intend to bring forward a

resolution entered on the House Journal citing Rep. von Ehlinger for contempt. The Committee subpoenaed Rep. von Ehlinger pursuant to Idaho Code Section 67-407 to appear before the Committee to testify on the allegations in the complaint filed against him in this matter. He appeared before the Committee but refused to testify as to the events of that night that primarily gave rise to the complaint, invoking the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution. After being informed that Idaho Code Section 67-411 provides that self-criminating testimony can be exacted by the Committee and that Idaho Code Section 67-409 provides that refusal to testify can lead to adoption of a resolution by the House citing him for contempt and after repeatedly waiving his silence during the Committee's investigation, Rep. von Ehlinger still refused to testify at the hearing. Dated 29th day of April, 2021.

Chairman Dixon restated the motion that **Rep. von Ehlinger** should be censured with the following restrictions and conditions: One, that he be immediately suspended without pay or benefits; two, that he must immediately vacate his office in the Capitol and not return to Capitol grounds for the remainder of the 66th Idaho Legislature; and three, that a substitute Representative should be appointed with compensation as soon as possible following his suspension so that District 6 remains with a Representative. He asked for any discussion on that motion.

Rep. Crane clarified the recommendation to suspend for the 66th Legislative Session, would be for this legislative session 2021, and for the next legislative session, 2022.

**VOTE ON
MOTION:**

Chairman Dixon called for a vote on the motion. **Motion carried by voice vote.**

Rep. Gannon gave a statement of his concerns about what happened yesterday when a witness left the Capitol through the hallway, and stated he would like to see an investigation of the incident. The last thing that anyone would ever want here is that witnesses are intimidated or harassed, and that means a witness of any political philosophy or any viewpoint or with any evidence. They should not be harassed by others who are here, and people should feel that if they come to this legislature, they can speak their minds, whether we like it or anybody likes it, regardless of opinions. And that was infringed upon yesterday, and he didn't know the extent because he didn't see it. But would like that investigated, and anybody who did harass or intimidate a witness should be reviewed for possible prosecution. He said the Committee cannot tolerate that kind of conduct here at the legislature by anybody.

Rep. Horman followed with a comment regarding the Committee having gone to great lengths to protect the identity of the intern. The Committee has never released the name. She said the Committee protected her visual identity when she chose to testify in the confidential portion of the investigation and yesterday. And had asked all in the room, including the press, to do that as she entered and exited the building. She said she shares the concerns of **Rep. Gannon** that have been expressed and will also be inquiring further into that incident yesterday.

Rep. McCrostie stated he joins in the sentiments of **Reps. Gannon** and **Horman**. He said he learned about what took place after the Committee was able to go home and think about things and then found out how **Jane Doe** was accosted. It's possible that that person or people are even here today, and it's troubling. And it may not be the purview of this particular Committee, but he certainly believed that it is something that needs to be pursued, that the people who come to our building where we come to work, that they need to be safe. And he expressed his support for that.

ADJOURN: There being no further business to come before the House Ethics Committee in the matter of **Rep. Aaron von Ehlinger**, the meeting adjourned at 10:54 a.m.

Representative Dixon
Chair

Susan Werlinger
Secretary