Congressional Research Service
Informing the legislative debate since 1914

Resolutions to Censure the President: Procedure and History

Updated August 1, 2019

Congressional Research Service
https://crsreports.congress.gov
R45087

CRS REPORT
Prepared for Members and
Committees of Congress

Summary

Censure is a reprimand adopted by one or both chambers of Congress against a Member of Congress, President, federal judge, or other government official. While Member censure is a disciplinary measure that is sanctioned by the Constitution (Article 1, Section 5), *non*-Member censure is not. Rather, it is a formal expression or "sense of" one or both houses of Congress.

Censure resolutions targeting non-Members have utilized a range of statements to highlight conduct deemed by the resolutions' sponsors to be inappropriate or unauthorized. Before the Nixon Administration, such resolutions included variations of the words or phrases: unconstitutional, usurpation, reproof, and abuse of power. Beginning in 1972, the most clearly "censorious" resolutions have contained the word, "censure," in the text.

Resolutions attempting to censure the President are usually simple resolutions. These resolutions are not privileged for consideration in the House or Senate. They are, instead, considered under the regular parliamentary mechanisms used to process "sense of" legislation.

Since 1800, Members of the House and Senate have introduced resolutions of censure against at least 12 sitting Presidents. Two additional Presidents received criticism via alternative means (a House committee report and an amendment to a resolution).

The clearest instance of a successful presidential censure is Andrew Jackson. The Senate approved a resolution of censure in 1834. On three other occasions, critical resolutions were adopted, but their final language, as amended, obscured the original intention to censure the President.

In the remaining cases, resolutions remained in committee, without further consideration, or were not adopted in a floor vote. Nevertheless, presidential censure attempts have become more frequent since the Watergate era.

This report summarizes the procedures that may be used to consider resolutions of censure and the history of attempts to censure the President (1st-115th Congresses). It also provides citations to additional reading material on the subject.

Contents

Definition of Censure 1
Congressional Consideration of Censure Resolutions 2
Two Types of Censure Resolutions 2
Resolutions That Censure a Representative or a Senator 2
Resolutions that Censure an Executive or Judicial Branch Official 3
House Procedure 3
Senate Procedure 4
History of Presidential Censure Attempts, 1789-2018, 1st-115th Congresses 4
Resolutions Adopted (1st-115th Congresses) 5
Andrew Jackson (1834) 5
James Buchanan (1860) 6
Abraham Lincoln (1864) 6
William Howard Taft (1912) 7
Censure Attempts, No Resolution Adopted (1st-115th Congresses) 7
John Adams (1800) 7
John Tyler (1842) 8
James K. Polk (1848) 8
Ulysses S. Grant (1871) 9
Harry S. Truman (1952) 9
Richard M. Nixon (1972/1973/1974) 10
William J. Clinton (1998/1999) 10
George W. Bush (2005/2006/2007) 11
Barack Obama (2013/2014/2016) 11
Donald Trump (2017/2018) 12

Tables

Table 1. Presidential Censure Attempts 13

Contacts

Author Information 19

Definition of Censure

Censure is a reprimand adopted by one or both chambers of Congress against a Member of Congress, President, federal judge, or other government official. Censure of a sitting Member of Congress is a formal disciplinary action, which is authorized by the Constitution. *Non*-Member censure, however, is not a disciplinary action, and it is not addressed in the Constitution. It is simply a means to highlight conduct deemed by the House or Senate to be inappropriate or in violation of the position held.

There is no uniform language used in resolutions to censure non-Members. This complicates efforts to identify and classify all attempts to censure the President. The presidential censure resolutions listed in this report contain variations of the words or phrases after the word, "resolved": censure, condemn, unconstitutional, usurp, unauthorized, abuse of power, violation, or disapproval.[1] Early resolutions of censure (Andrew Jackson, 1834; Abraham Lincoln, 1864) criticized the President for acting in "derogation" of the Constitution.[2]

Since the Nixon era, resolutions of censure have more frequently included the word "censure" in the text. In most such instances, "censure" is paired with the word, "condemn." For instance, a recently-introduced resolution of censure, H.Res. 490 (116th Congress), "censures and condemns President Donald Trump for his tweets made on July 14 and 15, 2019."[3]

This report references other post-Nixon resolutions of presidential rebuke that do not use the word, "censure," such as H.Res. 489, the resolution agreed to by the House on July 16, 2019.[4] That resolution condemned the President's use of language directed at Members of Congress, but it did not censure the President as an individual.

[1] Secondary sources on presidential censure attempts include Merrill D. Peterson, *The Great Triumvirate: Webster, Clay, and Calhoun* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987); Robert V. Remini, *Andrew Jackson and the Course of American Democracy, 1833-1845* (New York: Harper & Row, 1984); Remini, *The House: The History of the House of Representatives* (New York: Smithsonian Books, 2006); Louis Fisher, *Constitutional Conflicts between Congress and the President*, sixth ed. (Laurence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2014); and essays posted by the Senate Historical Office (senate.gov) and the House Office of the Historian (house.gov). Primary sources include the *House Journal*, *Senate Journal*, *Congressional Globe*, *Annals of Congress*, *Register of Debates*, *Congressional Record*, Congress.gov, the Legislative Information System of the U.S. Congress (LIS), and other congressional documents accessed in ProQuest Congressional.

[2] This report does not identify every pre-1972 resolution that criticized a President in the preamble ("whereas" clauses) that preceded the word, "resolved." For an example of this type of resolution, see the House resolution targeting President Theodore Roosevelt, which was agreed to by the House on January 8, 1909. This resolution was submitted in response to the President's annual message to Congress, which implied that the House had adopted an amendment to prevent the Secret Service from investigating Members. In the preamble, the resolution stated that the House considered "the language of the President in his message of December 8, 1908, unjustified and without basis of fact and that it constitutes a breach of the privileges of the House." Therefore, it resolved: "That the House, in the exercise of its constitutional prerogatives, declines to consider any communication from any source which is not in its own judgement respectful." See *Congressional Record*, 60th Cong., 2nd sess. (8 January 1909): pp. 645–684.

[3] H.Res. 490 (116th Congress), "Condemning and censuring President Donald Trump."

[4] H.Res. 489 (116th Congress), "Condemning President Trump's racist comments directed at Members of Congress." Also see H.Res. 494 (116th Congress), "Condemning the false, inflammatory, and racially offensive statements made by the President of the United States regarding four women of color who are duly elected Members of the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress."

Congressional Consideration of Censure Resolutions

Two Types of Censure Resolutions

There are two types of censure resolutions: those that target Members of Congress and those that target executive or judicial branch officials. Article 1, Section 5, of the Constitution grants each chamber the ability to "punish its Members for disorderly Behaviour."[5] Resolutions censuring a Senator or Representative are based on this power.

In contrast, Congress has no disciplinary authority over the President except through impeachment. Thus, presidential censure resolutions express the "sense of" the House and/or Senate without additional legal implications.[6]

Both Member and non-Member censure resolutions are usually simple resolutions.[7] As such, they do not have the force of law and are not signed by the President. However, the House and Senate treat the two types of censure resolutions differently in a parliamentary sense.

Resolutions That Censure a Representative or a Senator

Simple resolutions that censure a Member of Congress for "disorderly behavior"—that is, resolutions carrying out the function of disciplining a Member under the Constitution—are privileged for consideration in both the House and Senate. In the House, privileged resolutions have precedence over the regular order of business; they can be called up on the floor when the House is not considering another matter.[8] In the Senate, the motions to proceed to privileged resolutions are not debatable."[9]

House censure resolutions generally qualify as questions of the privileges of the House under Rule IX.[10] In this context, the censure of a Representative would occur through a formal vote of the House on a resolution disapproving of the Member's conduct. Such resolutions include the requirement that the offending Member stand in the well of the House as the resolution of censure

---

[5] "Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behaviour, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member," U.S. Constitution, Article 1, Section 5.

[6] For more information, see CRS Report 98-825, *"Sense of" Resolutions and Provisions*, by Christopher M. Davis.

[7] Most, but not all, presidential censure resolutions have been simple resolutions. Presidents Harry Truman and Richard Nixon were the subject of proposed concurrent resolutions of censure. (Concurrent resolutions must be adopted by both chambers but do not have the force of law.) President Bill Clinton is the only known President to be the focus of joint resolutions of censure. Had these joint resolutions passed, the President would have had to sign them, veto them, or allow them to become law without his signature. See CRS Report 98-706, *Bills and Resolutions: Examples of How Each Kind Is Used*, by Richard S. Beth.

[8] See CRS Report 98-315, *Privileged Business on the House Floor*, by James V. Saturno.

[9] See CRS Report RS21255, *Motions to Proceed to Consider Measures in the Senate: Who Offers Them?*, by Richard S. Beth and Mark J. Oleszek.

[10] "A resolution recommending reprimand, censure, or expulsion of a Member presents a question of privilege, as does one disapproving of the behavior of a Member inside or outside the Chamber. If reported by the Committee on Ethics (or a derivation thereof), the resolution may be called up at any time after the committee has filed its report." U.S. Congress, House, *Constitution, Jefferson's Manual and Rules of the House of Representatives*, prepared by Thomas J. Wickham, Parliamentarian, 114th Cong., 2nd Sess., 2017, H.Doc. 114-192 (Washington: GPO, 2017), sections 62-63, p. 29; CRS Report R44005, *Questions of the Privileges of the House: An Analysis*, by Megan S. Lynch; CRS Report 98-411, *Questions of Privilege in the House*, by James V. Saturno.

is read aloud by the Speaker.[11] (If the resolution reprimands a Member of the House without using the term censure, this step is not taken.) The most recent instance of a Representative being formally censured in this way by the House occurred in 2010.[12]

In the Senate, the Select Committee on Ethics may recommend disciplinary action against a Senator, including "censure, expulsion, or recommendation to the appropriate party conference regarding such Member's seniority or positions of responsibility." The last time a Senator was formally censured by such a privileged resolution was in 1990.[13]

Resolutions that Censure an Executive or Judicial Branch Official

While resolutions censuring a Member of Congress are privileged in the respective chamber, resolutions that censure, condemn, disapprove of, or express a loss of confidence in an executive or judicial branch official are not privileged and do not enjoy a special parliamentary status. Non-Member censure resolutions express the formal opinion of the House or Senate.[14] Thus, they are considered under the regular parliamentary mechanisms used to process "sense of" legislation.[15]

The last presidential censure resolution to receive congressional floor consideration occurred in the Senate in 1912 (William Howard Taft). All subsequent resolutions have been referred to House or Senate committees without further action.[16] Nevertheless, the following parliamentary scenarios are possible when considering non-Member censure resolutions.

House Procedure

Should a House committee report a non-Member censure resolution, the full House may consider it by unanimous consent, under the Suspension of the Rules procedure, or under the terms of a special rule reported by the Committee on Rules and adopted by the House.[17] If widespread support exists for the censure resolution, unanimous consent or the Suspension of the Rules procedure may be used. Otherwise, the resolution could be brought to the floor under a special rule reported by the Committee on Rules. All three of these parliamentary mechanisms require, at a minimum, the support of the majority party leadership in order to be entertained.

---

[11] Charles W. Johnson, John V. Sullivan, and Thomas J. Wickham, Jr., *House Practice: A Guide to the Rules, Precedents, and Procedures of the House* (Washington: GPO: 2017), pp. 509-541, https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/GPO-HPRACTICE-115/pdf/GPO-HPRACTICE-115-26.pdf.

[12] U.S. Congress, House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, *Adjudicatory Subcommittee Hearing in the Matter of Representative Charles B. Rangel Opening Statement of Chair Zoe Lofgren*, 111th Cong., 2nd Sess., November 15, 2010, pp. 1-2, http://docs.house.gov/ethics/RangelChairOpeningStatement.pdf.

[13] *United States Senate Election, Expulsion and Censure Cases: 1793-1990*, prepared by Anne M. Butler and Wendy Wolff, U.S. Senate Historical Office, 103rd Cong., 1st Sess., S.Doc. 103-33 (Washington: GPO, 1995).

[14] See CRS Report RL34037, *Congressional Censure and "No Confidence" Votes Regarding Public Officials*, coordinated by Cynthia Brown.

[15] See CRS Report 98-825, *"Sense of" Resolutions and Provisions*, by Christopher M. Davis.

[16] The most recent presidential censure resolution, H.Res. 700 (115th Congress), has been referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary. CRS Report 98-825, *"Sense of" Resolutions and Provisions*, by Christopher M. Davis.

[17] Under long-standing policies announced by the Speaker, such a unanimous consent request would have to be cleared in advance by the bipartisan committee and floor leadership in order to be entertained. The Suspension of the Rules procedure lays aside any parliamentary barriers to considering the measure but requires a two-thirds vote for passage. CRS Report 98-314, *Suspension of the Rules in the House: Principal Features*, by Elizabeth Rybicki, CRS Report 98-354, *How Special Rules Regulate Calling up Measures for Consideration in the House*, by Richard S. Beth.

If the censure resolution was not supported by the House majority party leadership, obtaining floor consideration would likely be difficult. Members could try to employ the House discharge rule (Rule XV, clause 2) to bring a censure resolution (or a special rule providing for its consideration) to the chamber floor.[18]

Senate Procedure

In the Senate, a Member could make a unanimous consent request to consider a censure resolution at the time it was submitted. If any Senator objected to this procedure, consideration of the resolution would effectively be blocked.[19]

A Senator might instead submit the resolution for it to be referred to committee in the usual way. The Senate committee might then report the censure resolution, allowing the measure to be called up on the floor by unanimous consent or by debatable motion.[20] In either case, the resolution and any preamble therein would each be separately debatable and amendable, including by non-germane amendment.

If a Senator introduces an amendment that contains censorious language or attempts to alter a resolution of censure, that amendment would also be subject to debate. As a result, without unanimous consent, one or more cloture processes, requiring supermajority vote thresholds, might be necessary in order to reach a final vote on censure language in the Senate.[21]

History of Presidential Censure Attempts, 1789-2018, 1st-115th Congresses

CRS identified 14 Presidents, including the current President, who experienced censure attempts while in office: 12 by resolutions of censure, one via a House committee report, and another through an amendment to an unrelated resolution. On four occasions, the House or Senate adopted resolutions that, in their original form, charged the President with abuse of power. Otherwise, presidential censure resolutions have remained in committee without further consideration or were not adopted in a floor vote.

---

[18] In order to discharge legislation from a committee, at least 218 Members must sign a discharge petition. CRS Report 97-552, *The Discharge Rule in the House: Principal Features and Uses*, by Richard S. Beth.

[19] Should there be an objection to the immediate consideration of such a resolution when it was submitted, the measure would go "over under the rule" and be placed on a special section of the Senate's *Calendar of Business* dedicated to such resolutions. Under current practice, simple resolutions that go "over under the rule" in this way are effectively moot and cannot be considered except by unanimous consent. U.S. Congress, Senate, *Riddick's Senate Procedure Precedents and Practices*, prepared by Floyd M. Riddick and Alan S. Frumin, 101st Cong., 2nd Sess., 1992, S.Doc. 101-28 (Washington: GPO, 1992), pp. 957-967. https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/GPO-RIDDICK-1992/pdf/GPO-RIDDICK-1992-93.pdf

[20] See CRS Report RS21255, *Motions to Proceed to Consider Measures in the Senate: Who Offers Them?*, by Richard S. Beth and Mark J. Oleszek.

[21] When considering censure resolutions, three-fifths of all Senators (normally 60) must vote to invoke cloture. See CRS Report RL30360, *Filibusters and Cloture in the Senate*, by Valerie Heitshusen and Richard S. Beth. In addition, a Senator might try to trigger a vote *in relation* to censure language by making a motion to Suspend the Rules. When voting on such a motion, the question before the Senate would be whether or not to lay aside any rules blocking floor consideration of censure legislation. U.S. Congress, Senate, *Riddick's Senate Procedure Precedents and Practices*, prepared by Floyd M. Riddick and Alan S. Frumin, 101st Cong., 2nd Sess., 1992, S.Doc. 101-28 (Washington: GPO, 1992), pp. 1266-1272, https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/GPO-RIDDICK-1992/pdf/GPO-RIDDICK-1992-134.pdf.

As stated earlier, there is no uniform language of censure. Therefore, the designation of censure is somewhat subjective. The censure resolutions identified in this report either contained the word "censure," or explicitly cited an alleged abuse of presidential power, following the word, "resolved."[22]

Prior to 1972, no identified House or Senate resolutions used the word "censure" in reference to the President; instead, resolutions of censure used a range of "censorious" terms to charge the President with inappropriate or unconstitutional conduct. Beginning with the Nixon Administration, resolutions more commonly use the word, "censure," in the text of the resolution.

The following sections provide additional information on each censure attempt, (1st through 115th Congresses). The measures are also listed in **Table 1**.

Resolutions Adopted (1st-115th Congresses)

The four adopted censure-related resolutions were all simple resolutions.[23] As such, they expressed the "sense of" the respective chamber but did not have the force of law or contain any disciplinary authority.

In two cases identified (Presidents Lincoln and Taft), the resolutions were amended on the chamber floor so that they no longer clearly censured the President. In another case (President Buchanan), the resolution's language may have intended a lesser rebuke than censure. The fourth case, President Andrew Jackson, remains the clearest case of presidential censure by resolution, although his censure was subsequently expunged.

Andrew Jackson (1834)

The Jackson case stemmed from a dispute over the Second Bank of the United States. In 1832, Jackson vetoed legislation to renew the Bank's charter and began removing the government's deposits. The following year, some Members of Congress launched an investigation, during which Jackson refused to provide a requested document. In response, on December 26, 1833, Senator Henry Clay of Kentucky (Anti-Jacksonian Party) submitted a resolution of censure. As modified by Clay, the measure resolved, "That the President, in the late Executive proceedings in relation to the public revenue, has assumed upon himself authority and power not conferred by the Constitution and laws, but in derogation of both."

On March 28, 1834, after three months of intense debate, the Senate agreed to the censure resolution. That April, Jackson submitted an "Executive protest," which argued that the Senate's censure of a non-Senator was "wholly unauthorized by the Constitution, and in derogation of its entire spirit." The Senate countered, on May 7, with resolutions that called the President's protest itself, "a breach of the privileges of the Senate," which could not be recognized or "entered on the Journals." By early 1837, however, pro-Jackson Democrats had gained the Senate majority, and they voted to remove the censure from chamber records. On January 16, the Secretary of the

[22] Censure resolutions were identified following a survey of secondary sources, including books on presidential/congressional relationships. Primary source research included a review of congressional documents and database searches using the keyword, President, with: censure, condemn, abuse, disapprove, violation, Constitution, unconstitutional, usurp, or unauthorized.

[23] For more information about the types of resolutions, see CRS Report 98-706, *Bills and Resolutions: Examples of How Each Kind Is Used*, by Richard S. Beth.

Senate drew black lines around the original resolution in the *Senate Journal*, adding the words, "Expunged by order of the Senate."[24]

James Buchanan (1860)

On June 11, 1860, Representative Robert Hatton of Tennessee (Opposition Party) reported five resolutions on behalf of the Committee on the Expenditures in the Navy Department, a select committee appointed during the previous 35th Congress. All five resolutions charged the Secretary of the Navy, Isaac Toucey, with ethical violations related to military contracts. The fourth resolution also reprimanded the President, alleging that the President and the Secretary awarded contracts based on "party relations" and the "pending elections." By doing so, the resolution stated, "they have set an example dangerous to the public safety, and deserving the reproof of this House." However, the fifth resolution, targeting just Toucey, used the word *censured* to condemn the Secretary's appointment of an engineer with financial interests in Navy projects.[25] Thus, it could be argued that the House chose a weaker reprimand for the President.

On June 13, the House voted to adopt all five resolutions. The fourth resolution, targeting the President and Secretary of the Navy, passed in a 106-61 vote.

Abraham Lincoln (1864)

On May 11, 1864, Senator Garret Davis of Kentucky (Unionist Party) introduced a resolution reprimanding President Lincoln for allowing two generals to return to military service after they won election to the House.[26] Senator Davis' original measure resolved, "That the arrangement aforesaid, made by the President and the Secretary of War with Generals Schenck and Blair, to receive from them temporarily their commissions of major general, with discretion, on their part, at any time during this session of Congress to resume them, was in derogation of the Constitution of the United States, and not within the power of the President and the Secretary of War, or either of them, to make."[27]

The Senate referred the resolution to the Judiciary Committee. On June 15, the committee reported, and the Senate approved, an amended version of the resolution. The new language affirmed that an officer must be re-appointed "in the manner provided by the Constitution," but no longer overtly censured the President.

---

[24] Peterson, pp. 240-241; *Register of Debates in Congress*, 23rd Cong., 1st Sess. (December 23, 1833-March 28, 1834), pp. 58-1187; "The President's Protest," *Register*, (May 5-7, 1834), pp. 1612-1712; "Expunging Resolution," *Register*, (January 12-16, 1837), pp. 379-418, 427-506.

[25] The fifth resolution stated, "That the appointment by the Secretary of the Navy of Daniel B. Martin, chief engineer, as a member of the board of engineers, to report upon proposals for constructing machinery for the United States, the said Martin at the time being pecuniarily interested in some of said proposals, is hereby censured by this House." *Congressional Globe*, 36th Cong., 1st. Sess. (June 13, 1860), p. 2949. For the entire debate on the resolutions, see pp. 2835-2836; 2938-2951.

[26] The generals were expected to resign from military service following their elections to Congress. Thus, if Lincoln allowed them to reengage in military activities, he was arguably recommissioning them without the consent of the Senate. According to the Constitution, The President "by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States." Article II, Section 2, Clause 2.

[27] *Senate Journal*, 38th Cong., 1st Sess. (May 11-June 15, 1864), pp. 428, 559.

William Howard Taft (1912)

On July 15, 1912, Senator Joseph Bailey of Texas (Democratic Party) introduced S.Res. 357 after President Taft was accused of trying to influence a disputed Senate election.[28] The original text resolved, "That any attempt on the part of the President of the United States to exercise the powers and influence of his great office for the purpose of controlling the vote of any Senator upon a question involving the right to a seat in the Senate violates the spirit, if not the letter, of the Constitution, invades the rights of the Senate, and ought to be severely condemned."[29]

In debate, Senator Bailey stated that his resolution targeted a "particular circumstance" involving the current President.[30] Still, he was open to amending his own resolution in order to gain supporters. On July 16, in a 35-23 vote, the Senate adopted the amended version of the resolution. The new text substituted "violates" to "would violate" and removed the final phrase, "and ought to be severely condemned." Thus, as amended, the resolution referred to potential presidential actions without specifically censuring Taft's past behavior.[31]

Censure Attempts, No Resolution Adopted (1st-115th Congresses)

Between 1800 and 1952, at least three Presidents were the subject of critical resolutions that were not adopted. In addition, one President (Polk) had his actions condemned by an amendment to a resolution, while another (Tyler) received criticism in a House committee report.

Richard Nixon's years in office (1969-1974) marked a new period in presidential censures. Since 1972, several Presidents have been subject to multiple censure attempts. Most resolutions have used variations of the phrase "censure and condemn." In reference to Presidents Nixon and Clinton, resolutions have also called for the President's resignation.[32] In all cases, these resolutions (1972-2018) have been referred to committee with no further action. Information on resolutions dated 1973-present is available from Congress.gov.

John Adams (1800)

On February 20, 1800, Representative Edward Livingston of New York (Jeffersonian Republican Party) introduced three resolutions accusing the President of judicial interference. The text described the case of a "fugitive" accused of crimes aboard a British ship. According to the first two resolutions, the President advised a federal judge to release the man into British custody, even though the fugitive claimed to be an American citizen acting in self-defense. The third resolution condemned the President, stating: "his advice and request to the Judge of the District Court ... are a dangerous interference of the Executive with Judicial decisions; and that the compliance with such advice and request on the part of the Judge of the District Court of South Carolina, is a sacrifice of the Constitutional independence of the Judicial power, and exposes the

[28] More information on the election case of William Lorimer is available at https://www.senate.gov/artandhistory/history/common/contested_elections/095William_Lorimer.htm.

[29] *Congressional Record*, vol. 48 (July 15, 1912), p. 9062.

[30] *Congressional Record*, (July 16, 1912), p. 9125.

[31] *Congressional Record*, (July 16, 1912), p. 9132.

[32] The resolutions calling for President Nixon's resignation were H.Res. 684 , H.Con.Res. 376, and H.Res. 734 (93rd Congress). The resolution calling for President Clinton's resignation was H.Res. 531 (105th Congress). This resolution did not contain the word, "censure," but it did use censorious language in its preamble ("whereas" clauses), including the phrases, "abused the Office of the President of the United States," "subverted the laws of the United States by providing false testimony," and "diminished the Office of President of the United States."

administration thereof to suspicion and reproach."[33] On March 8, the full House voted (61-35) in concurrence with the Committee of the Whole's decision to defeat the three resolutions.[34]

John Tyler (1842)

The Tyler case followed the unexpected death of President William Henry Harrison early in his term of office. Once John Tyler assumed the presidency, he vetoed a number of bills, angering several Members of Congress. On August 10, 1842, the former President, Representative John Quincy Adams of Massachusetts (Whig Party), moved to form a select committee to consider the President's latest veto message and "report thereon."[35] The following week, Representative Adams submitted the committee's report, which recommended a constitutional amendment to lower the threshold to overturn presidential vetoes from a two-thirds vote to a simple majority.[36]

The report itself issued criticism of the President's actions, including his "continual and unrelenting exercise of executive legislation, by the alternate gross abuse of constitutional power and bold assumption of powers never vested in him by any law."[37] On August 17, the House voted (100-80) to approve the report, but did not have the necessary two-thirds support required to adopt the resolution amending the Constitution.[38]

In this case, the House did not approve a censure resolution. Still, the report itself may be considered a form of presidential censure. In response to the criticism, Tyler submitted an official protest, but the House refused to recognize it.[39]

James K. Polk (1848)

On January 3, 1848, the House considered a resolution congratulating Generals Zachary Taylor and Winfield Scott for their military service during the Mexican-American War. Representative George Ashmun of Massachusetts (Whig Party) offered an amendment to a motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Military Affairs. The amendment instructed the committee to add the phrase, "in a war unnecessarily and unconstitutionally begun by the President" to the resolution. In an 85-81 vote, the House approved the amendment.[40] However, the underlying

[33] "Case of Jonathan Robbins," *Congressional Globe*, 6th Cong., 1st Sess. (February 20, 1800), pp. 532-533.

[34] *Congressional Globe*, (March 8, 1800), p. 619.

[35] *Congressional Globe, 27th Cong.*, 27th Cong., 2nd Sess. (August 10, 1842), p. 874.

[36] U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 7, Clause 2: "Every Bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a Law, be presented to the President of the United States; If he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his Objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the Objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it. If after such Reconsideration two thirds of that House shall agree to pass the Bill, it shall be sent, together with the Objections, to the other House, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two thirds of that House, it shall become a Law."

[37] *House Journal*, 27th Cong., 2nd Sess. (August 17, 1842), p. 1349.

[38] *Journal*, p. 1346. At the time, it was considered unusual for the House to approve a report separately from accompanying legislation. However, Representative John Botts successfully moved to divide the question, enabling a separate vote on the report. According to the *Congressional Globe*, "Whilst it was impracticable to carry into effect the object of the resolution, he wished to see who were in favor of the report." *Globe*, 27th Cong, 2nd Sess., (August 17, 1842), p. 907. In current practice, neither house votes to approve a report accompanying a bill or resolution.

[39] "The Protest," *Congressional Globe*, (August 30, 1842), pp. 973-975.

[40] *Congressional Globe*, 30th Cong., 1st Sess. (January 3, 1848), p. 95.

resolution was never adopted. Instead, both chambers passed a joint resolution in praise of the generals, and this one included no criticism of Polk or the war.[41]

Ulysses S. Grant (1871)

The Grant case followed months of acrimony between the President and Senator Charles Sumner of Massachusetts (Republican Party), who previously served as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. As chairman, Senator Sumner led efforts to defeat the President's treaty to annex the Dominican Republic. However, the conflict subsequently led to Sumner's replacement as chairman at the start of the 42nd Congress (March 4, 1871).[42] On March 24, Senator Sumner introduced an eight-part resolution that addressed the President's recent deployment of ships along the Dominican coast. Section five of the resolution called the action, without the authority of Congress, "an infraction of the Constitution of the United States and a usurpation of power not conferred upon the President."[43] On March 27, Senator Sumner modified his own resolution to insert additional text: this "belligerent intervention ... [was] unauthorized violence, utterly without support in law or reason, and proceeding directly from that kingly prerogative which is disowned by the Constitution of the United States."[44] Two days later, the Senate voted 39-16 to table the resolution.[45]

Harry S. Truman (1952)

During the Korean War, steel workers were scheduled to strike on April 9, 1952. However, hours before the scheduled walkout, President Truman issued an executive order directing the Department of Commerce to seize control of steel mills associated with the United Steelworkers of America.[46] In response, Representative Burr Powell Harrison of Virginia (Democratic Party) introduced H.Con.Res. 207, condemning the seizure as "without authority in law."[47]

The measure marked the first known attempt to reprimand a President with a concurrent resolution. Such measures require the agreement of both houses of Congress. However, on April 9, the resolution was referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary and received no further consideration.[48]

---

[41] *Congressional Globe*, (February 7, 1848), p. 304; (May 4, 1848), p. 725.

[42] Sumner's stance on the treaty damaged his relationship with Secretary of State Hamilton Fish. According to biographer Frederick J. Blue, pro-Grant Republican senators "used Sumner's break with Fish as proof that his usefulness as chair of the Foreign Relations Committee has been seriously impaired," prompting the Republican Conference to vote, 26 to 21, for Sumner's removal as chairman. Frederick J. Blue, *Charles Sumner and the Conscience of the North* (Arlington Heights, IL: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 1994), p. 194; David T. Canon et al., *Committees in the U.S.* Congress: 1789-1946, vol. 2 (Washington, D.C.: CQ Press, 2002), p. 118.

[43] *Senate Journal*, 42nd Cong., 1st Sess. (March 24, 1871), p. 90.

[44] *Senate Journal*, (March 27, 1871), p. 96.

[45] *Senate Journal* (March 29, 1871), p. 98.

[46] For more information about the steel mill seizure, see Maeva Marcus, *Truman and the Steel Seizure Case: The Limits on Presidential Power* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1994). In June 1952, the Supreme Court ruled that the seizure was not authorized under the Constitution or laws of the United States. U.S. Supreme Court, *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579 (1952).

[47] H.Con.Res. 207 (82nd Congress).

[48] "Steel Plant Seizure." In *CQ Almanac 1952*, 8th ed., 320-25. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly, 1953. http://library.cqpress.com/cqalmanac/cqal52-1379437.

Richard M. Nixon (1972/1973/1974)

Beginning in 1972, President Nixon was the subject of several House resolutions (simple and concurrent) that either sought his censure or called for his resignation. Introduced on January 18, 1972, H.Con.Res. 500 (92nd Congress) addressed the President's conduct during the Vietnam War.[49] It was referred to the House Foreign Affairs Committee. All other resolutions pertained to the President's conduct related to the Watergate break-in (June 17, 1972) and were referred to the House Judiciary Committee.

The first group of Watergate resolutions, submitted between October 23, 1973, and December 4, 1973, followed the firing of special prosecutor Archibald Cox on October 20. The second set, H.Res. 1288 and H.Con.Res. 589 (August 2 and 8, 1974), were submitted after the Judiciary Committee adopted articles of impeachment (July 27-30, 1974).[50]

Three resolutions, H.Res. 684, H.Con.Res. 376, and H.Res. 734, stated that the President "should resign" but did not cite a specific abuse of power. Thus, they arguably could be considered "no confidence" resolutions, not measures explicitly expressing censure.[51]

Nixon resigned on August 9, 1974, one day after the last censure resolution, H.Con.Res. 589, was submitted.

William J. Clinton (1998/1999)

The Clinton resolutions concerned the President's testimony before a grand jury in August 1998. The testimony was alleged to contradict an earlier deposition that the President had given in January. In response, some Members of Congress considered either censuring or impeaching the President for perjury and obstruction of justice.

Introduced between September 1998 and February 1999, five resolutions considered alternatives to impeachment proceedings. H.Res. 531 called for the President's immediate resignation. All other resolutions used variations of the phrase, "censure and condemn," in reference to the President's conduct.[52]

H.J.Res. 139 and H.J.Res. 140 were introduced on December 17, 1998, two days before the House approved two articles of impeachment, while H.J.Res. 12 (January 6, 1999) was introduced one day before the start of the President's Senate impeachment trial. The final resolution, S.Res. 44, was introduced on February 12, 1999, the same day that the Senate voted to acquit the President of all charges.

Note that H.J.Res. 139, H.J.Res. 140, and H.J.Res. 12 were joint resolutions.[53] Unlike simple and concurrent resolutions, final approval of joint resolutions requires passage by both houses of Congress, and then the President must sign them or allow them to become law without his

[49] According to the resolution, President Nixon violated the law and the "will of Congress," by "failing and refusing" to withdraw American troops from Indochina as directed by the "Mansfield amendment" (Section 601, P.L. 92-156).

[50] For more information on the House's reaction to the President Nixon's Watergate-related conduct, see Remini, *The House*, pp. 437-442.

[51] See CRS Report RL34037, *Congressional Censure and "No Confidence" Votes Regarding Public Officials*, coordinated by Cynthia Brown.

[52] For more information on the President Clinton investigation and congressional response, including impeachment proceedings, see Remini, *The House*, pp. 489-495.

[53] See CRS Report 98-706, *Bills and Resolutions: Examples of How Each Kind Is Used*, by Richard S. Beth.

signature.[54] These specific joint resolutions also mandated that the President, by his signature, agree to the following conditions: acknowledge censure and condemnation, donate $500,000 to the Treasury, not deliver in person any State of the Union address, not involve himself in Democratic Party or campaign activities, and not serve in public office after his term as President concluded. The joint resolutions' procedural and policy requirements made them the most controversial of the Clinton censure resolutions.[55] However, like the other censure resolutions, the joint resolutions were referred to committee without further consideration.[56]

George W. Bush (2005/2006/2007)

The George W. Bush resolutions addressed the Administration's response to the September 11, 2001, attack on the United States and its prosecution of the global war on terrorism. S.Res. 398 charged the "unlawful authorization of wiretaps of Americans." S.Res. 303 and H.Res. 626 targeted President Bush and Attorney General Alberto R. Gonzales; both measures resolved to censure and condemn them for "disregarding statutes, treaties, and the Constitution." The remaining four resolutions, H.Res. 636, H.Res. 530, S.Res. 302, and H.Res. 625 sought to censure either President Bush alone, or in addition to Vice President Richard Cheney, for actions related to the war in Iraq.

S.Res. 302 was referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The other resolutions were referred to either the House or Senate Judiciary Committees.[57] While no resolutions were reported out of committee, the Senate Judiciary Committee, on March 31, 2006, held hearings on S.Res. 398.

Barack Obama (2013/2014/2016)

In the 114th Congress, three House resolutions targeted President Obama, using the term, "the House of Representatives does hereby condemn and censure Barack Obama." Another two resolutions, introduced in the 113th Congress, criticized the President's actions, but did not include the word, "censure." All of the measures were simple House resolutions, which were referred to the Judiciary Committee, and subsequently by the committee to its Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice. The resolutions received no further action.

H.Res. 582 resolved to censure the President "for having willfully disregarded the legislative powers of the duly elected Congress provided by the Constitution of the United States through his executive actions to deprive American citizens of their constitutionally mandated right to bear arms under the Second Amendment." H.Res. 588 (114h Congress) stated that the President

---

[54] If a President vetoes a resolution, Congress may attempt to override the veto. Veto overrides require a two-thirds vote in each chamber.

[55] Had the joint resolutions passed, they may have prompted constitutional concerns. See the debate on joint resolutions of censure in the Committee on the Judiciary: U.S. Congress, House Committee on the Judiciary, *Impeachment Inquiry: William Jefferson Clinton, President of the United States*, committee print, 105th Cong., 2nd Sess., December 10, 1998, Ser. No. 18 (Washington: GPO, 1999), p. 646. The Constitution does not give Congress the authority to punish the President outside of impeachment proceedings; furthermore, Congress may not enact "bills of attainder," which are defined by the Supreme Court as legislation that "determines guilt and inflicts punishment upon an identifiable individual without provision of the protections of a judicial trial." United States v. Brown, 381 U.S. 437, 468 (1965); CRS Report R40826, *Bills of Attainder: The Constitutional Implications of Congress Legislating Narrowly*, by Kenneth R. Thomas (out of print; available to congressional clients from the author upon request).

[56] The House resolutions were referred to the Judiciary Committee. The Senate resolution was referred to the Rules and Administration Committee.

[57] H.Res. 530, H.Res. 625, and H.Res. 626 were subsequently referred to the House Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties.

"willfully disregarded the President's constitutional responsibilities as Commander in Chief of the United States through his continued failed lack of foreign affairs strategy, failure to follow the advice of military and intelligence advisors, and failed national security policy." H.Res. 607 charged Obama for operating "outside of the rule of law and the authority granted to him by the Constitution of the United States."

The critical resolutions from the 113th Congress, H.Res. 425 and H.Res. 652, used alternative terms to reprimand the President. H.Res. 425 resolved that the House "disapproves of the President's failure to 'take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed' as required by the Constitution." H.Res. 652 resolved that the House "condemns the President and the executive branch of Government for actions and acts that are beyond the clearly defined laws of the United States."

Given that the phrase "condemns the President" follows the word "resolved," it could be argued that H.Res. 652 is a resolution of censure. In H.Res. 425, the resolution disapproves of the President's actions, but it does not censure or condemn the President as an individual. Arguably, it is not a resolution of censure.

Donald Trump (2017/2018)

In the 115th Congress (2017-2018), President Trump was the subject of two censure resolutions. The first resolution, H.Res. 496, "Condemning and censuring President Donald Trump," was submitted on August 18, 2017, one week after a counter protestor was killed at the site of a political rally organized by several self-described alt-right and white supremacist groups and individuals. The resolution charged the President with failing to "specifically condemn the 'Unite the Right' rally" and for asserting that "'both sides' were to blame for the violence in Charlottesville, Virginia."[58] The resolution was referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary with no further action.

Early in 2018, another resolution, H.Res. 700, expressing the "sense of the House of Representatives regarding President Donald J. Trump's remarks about Haiti, El Salvador, and African Nations" was submitted. The resolution sought to "censure and condemn President Donald Trump" for his statements made at a January 11, 2018, White House meeting. According to the resolution, the President's comments were "hateful, discriminatory, and racist …" The resolution was submitted on January 18, 2018, and referred to the Committees on the Judiciary and to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with no further action.[59]

[58] H.Res. 496 (115th Congress), "Condemning and censuring President Donald Trump."

[59] In the 116th Congress, as of August 2019, President Trump has been the subject of three resolutions intended to either censure him or condemn the language he used in a tweet on July 14, 2019. On July 16, the House agreed to H.Res. 489, "condemning President Trump's racist comments directed at Members of Congress." Another resolution, H.Res. 494, condemned what the resolution described as "the false, inflammatory, and racially offensive statements made by the President of the United States regarding four women of color who are duly elected Members of the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress." It was referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary. H.Res. 490, "condemning and censuring President Donald Trump," was also submitted and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Table 1. Presidential Censure Attempts

(1789-2016, 1st - 115th Congresses)

President (Party)	Congress	Chamber	Date Introduced	Measure(s)	Sponsor (Party)	Language	Final Action
John Adams (Federalist)	6th (1799-1801)	House	February 20, 1800	3 simple resolutions	Edward Livingston (Jeffersonian Republican)	"a sacrifice of the Constitutional independence of the Judicial power, and exposes the administration thereof to suspicion and reproach"	Defeated in Committee of the Whole, March 8, 1800
Andrew Jackson (Democratic Republican)	23rd (1833-1835)	Senate	December 26, 1833	1 simple resolution	Henry Clay (Anti-Jacksonian)	"has assumed upon himself authority and power not conferred by the Constitution and laws, but in derogation of both"	Agreed to on March 28, 1834 (expunged by Senate vote on January 16, 1837)
John Tyler (Whig)	27th (1841-1843)	House	August 17, 1842	House committee report	John Quincy Adams (Whig)	"gross abuse of constitutional power and bold assumption of powers never vested in him by any law"	Report adopted on August 17, 1842
James K. Polk (Democratic)	30th (1847-1849)	House	January 3, 1848	Amendment to a motion to refer a resolution	George Ashmun (Whig)	"a war unnecessarily and unconstitutionally begun by the President"	Amendment adopted January 3, 1848 (underlying resolution did not pass)
James Buchanan (Democratic)	36th (1859-1861)	House	June 11, 1860	5 simple resolutions	Robert Hatton (Opposition)	"the President and Secretary of the Navy ... have set an example dangerous to the public safety, and deserving the reproof of this House"	Agreed to on June 13, 1860

President (Party)	Congress	Chamber	Date Introduced	Measure(s)	Sponsor (Party)	Language	Final Action
Abraham Lincoln (Republican)	38th (1863-1865)	Senate	May 11, 1864	1 simple resolution	Garret Davis (Unionist)	"the arrangement aforesaid, made by the President and the Secretary of War ... was in derogation of the Constitution of the United States, and not within the power of the President and the Secretary of War, or either of them, to make" (original text)	Amended resolution agreed to on June 15, 1864
Ulysses S. Grant (Republican)	42nd (1871-1873)	Senate	March 24, 1871	1 simple resolution	Charles Sumner (Republican)	"an infraction of the Constitution of the United States and a usurpation of power not conferred upon the President"	Tabled on March 29, 1871
William Howard Taft (Republican)	62nd (1911-1913)	Senate	July 15, 1912	S.Res. 357	Joseph Bailey (Democratic)	"any attempt on the part of the President of the United States to exercise the powers and influence of his great office for the purpose of controlling the vote of any Senator upon a question involving the right to a seat in the Senate violates the spirit, if not the letter, of the Constitution, invades the rights of the Senate, and ought to be severely condemned" (original text)	Amended resolution agreed to on July 16, 1912
Harry S. Truman (Democratic)	82nd (1951-1952)	House	April 9th, 1952	H.Con.Res. 207	Burr Powell Harrison (Democratic)	"without authority in law ... without due process of law" (the resolution's summary uses stronger language: "condemning as unlawful")	Referred to House Committee on the Judiciary

President (Party)	Congress	Chamber	Date Introduced	Measure(s)	Sponsor (Party)	Language	Final Action
Richard M. Nixon (Republican)	92nd (1971-1972)	House	January 18, 1972	H.Con.Res. 500	Bella Savitzky Abzug (Democratic)	"the aforementioned conduct of the President and the United States should be, and hereby is disapproved and censured"	Referred to the House Foreign Affairs Committee
Richard M. Nixon (Republican)	93rd (1973-1974)	House	October 23, 1973	H.Con.Res. 365	Clarence D. Long (Democratic)	"hereby censured and condemned for his publicly announced defiance of the judicial branch"	Referred to House Judiciary Committee
Richard M. Nixon (Republican)	93rd (1973-1974)	House	October 30, 1973	H.Con.Res. 371	Clarence D. Long (Democratic)	"hereby censured for his break of public trust and obstruction of the judicial process"	Referred to House Judiciary Committee
Richard M. Nixon (Republican)	93rd (1973-1974)	House	August 2, 1974	H.Res. 1288	Paul Findley (Republican)	"should be and he is hereby censured for said moral insensitivity, negligence, and maladministration"	Referred to House Judiciary Committee
Richard M. Nixon (Republican)	93rd (1973-1974)	House	August 8, 1974	H.Con.Res. 589	Dale Milford (Democratic)	"severely censured for moral insensitivity, gross negligence, maladministration, and the violation of his oath of office"	Referred to House Judiciary Committee
William J. Clinton (Democratic)	105th (1997-1998)	House	December 17, 1998	H.J.Res. 139	Amo Houghton (Republican)	"fully deserves, the censure and condemnation of the American people and the Congress"	Referred to House Judiciary Committee
William J. Clinton (Democratic)	105th (1997-1998)	House	December 17, 1998	H.J.Res. 140	Paul McHale (Democratic)	"censure and condemn William Jefferson Clinton for having engaged in a pattern of deceitful and dishonest conduct"	Referred to House Judiciary Committee
William J. Clinton (Democratic)	106th (1999-2000)	House	January 6, 1999	H.J.Res. 12	Amo Houghton (Republican)	"by his conduct has brought upon himself, and fully deserves, the censure and condemnation of the American people and the Congress"	Referred to House Judiciary Committee

President (Party)	Congress	Chamber	Date Introduced	Measure(s)	Sponsor (Party)	Language	Final Action
William J. Clinton (Democratic)	106th (1999-2000)	Senate	February 12, 1999	S.Res. 44	Dianne Feinstein (Democratic)	"censure William Jefferson Clinton ... and does condemn his wrongful conduct in the strongest terms"	Referred to Senate Rules and Administration Committee
George W. Bush (Republican)	109th (2005-2006)	House	December 18, 2005	H.Res. 636	John Conyers, Jr. (Democratic)	"does hereby censure President George W. Bush"	Referred to House Judiciary Committee
George W. Bush (Republican)	109th (2005-2006)	Senate	March 31, 2006	S.Res. 398	Russell Feingold (Democratic)	"does hereby censure George W. Bush, President of the United States, and does condemn his unlawful authorization of wiretaps"	Referred to Senate Judiciary Committee (hearings held)
George W. Bush (Republican)	110th (2007-2008)	House	July 10, 2007	H.Res. 530	Robert Wexler (Democratic)	"does hereby censure George W. Bush ... and does condemn his ... unconscionable abuse of his authority"	Referred to House Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties
George W. Bush (Republican)	110th (2007-2008)	Senate	August 3, 2007	S.Res. 302	Russell Feingold (Democratic)	"censures President George W. Bush and Vice President Richard B. Cheney for misleading the American people"	Referred to Senate Foreign Relations Committee
George W. Bush (Republican)	110th (2007-2008)	Senate	August 3, 2007	S.Res. 303	Russell Feingold (Democratic)	"censures George W. Bush, President of the United States, and Alberto R. Gonzales, Attorney General of the United States, and condemns their lengthy record of undermining the rule of law and the separation of powers"	Referred to Senate Judiciary Committee
George W. Bush (Republican)	110th (2007-2008)	House	August 4, 2007	H.Res. 625	Maurice D. Hinchey (Democratic)	"censures President George W. Bush and Vice President Richard B. Cheney for misleading the American people"	Referred to House Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties

President (Party)	Congress	Chamber	Date Introduced	Measure(s)	Sponsor (Party)	Language	Final Action
George W. Bush (Republican)	110th (2007-2008)	House	August 4, 2007	H.Res. 626	Maurice D. Hinchey (Democratic)	"censures George W. Bush, President of the United States, and Alberto R. Gonzales, Attorney General of the United States, and condemns their lengthy record of undermining the rule of law and the separation of powers"	Referred to House Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties
Barack Obama (Democratic)	113th (2013-2014)	House	June 26, 2014	H.Res. 652[a]	Randy K. Weber (Republican)	"condemns the President and the executive branch of Government for actions and acts that are beyond the clearly defined laws of the United States"	Referred to House Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice
Barack Obama (Democratic)	114th (2015-2016)	House	January 7, 2016	H.Res. 582	Steven M. Palazzo (Republican)	"does hereby censure and condemn Barack Obama for having willfully disregarded the legislative powers of the duly elected Congress provided by the Constitution of the United States through his executive actions"	Referred to House Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice
Barack Obama (Democratic)	114th (2015-2016)	House	January 13, 2016	H.Res. 588	Ted S. Yoho (Republican)	"does hereby censure and condemn President Barack Obama for having willfully disregarded the President's constitutional responsibilities as Commander in Chief of the United States"	Referred to House Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice
Barack Obama (Democratic)	114th (2015-2016)	House	February 4, 2016	H.Res. 607	Dennis A. Ross (Republican)	"does hereby condemn and censure President Barack Obama"	Referred to House Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice

President (Party)	Congress	Chamber	Date Introduced	Measure(s)	Sponsor (Party)	Language	Final Action
Donald J. Trump (Republican)	115th (2017-2018)	House	August 18, 2017	H.Res. 496	Jerrold Nadler (Democratic)	"does hereby censure and condemn President Donald Trump for his inadequate response to the violence in Charlottesville, Virginia"	Referred to House Judiciary Committee
Donald J. Trump (Republican)[b]	115th (2017-2018)	House	January 18, 2018	H.Res. 700	Cedric L. Richmond (Democratic)	"censure and condemn President Donald Trump for his statements at the January 11, 2018, White House meeting, which are hateful, discriminatory, and racist"	Referred to House Judiciary Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee

Source: *House Journal*, *Senate Journal*, *Annals of Congress*, *Congressional Globe*, *Register of Debates*, *Congressional Record*, *ProQuest Congressional*, and *Congress.gov*.

Notes:

a. Beginning in 1972, resolutions most clearly intending to censure a President used the word, "censure," in the resolution. H.Res. 652 does not use the word, "censure," but it is arguably a resolution of censure because it "condemns" the President as an individual, rather than simply condemning the actions of the President.

b. As of August 2019, President Trump has been the subject of one additional resolution of presidential censure. H.Res. 490 ("Condemning and censuring President Donald Trump,"116th Congress) "censures and condemns President Donald Trump for his tweets made on July 14 and 15, 2019." It was referred to the House Judiciary Committee. Another two resolutions condemned the actions of the President. The House agreed to H.Res. 489, "condemning President Trump's racist comments directed at Members of Congress," on July 16, 2019. H.Res. 494 was referred to the House Judiciary Committee.

Author Information

Jane A. Hudiburg
Analyst on Congress and the Legislative Process

Christopher M. Davis
Analyst on Congress and the Legislative Process

Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS's institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.