THE WHITSTONE
LEDGER

Legislating and Speculating: The Governance Dilemma of Congressional Stock Trading

By: Michael Lihanda

In contemporary American governance, questions of institutional integrity increasingly hinge not on the legality of individual conduct, but on the design of the systems that permit it. Few issues illustrate this more sharply than the longstanding and legally sanctioned practice of securities trading by members of the United States Congress. Though often viewed through a lens of ethics or propriety, the matter invites a more structural inquiry: what are the implications, democratic and constitutional, of permitting lawmakers to participate in financial markets over which they hold regulatory authority?

This practice is neither novel nor hidden. Members of Congress are permitted to buy and sell individual stocks while in office, even in sectors where pending legislation, regulatory decisions, or confidential briefings might materially influence market outcomes. While this conduct is constrained by disclosure requirements under the STOCK Act of 2012—legislation designed to enhance transparency and discourage insider trading—the legal framework imposes few substantive barriers. Public officials must report certain trades within a fixed period, and are theoretically barred from acting on nonpublic information acquired through their role. In practice, however, enforcement is rare, monitoring is diffuse, and the standard of proof required to prosecute violations remains prohibitively high.

THE WHITSTONE
LEDGER

Legislating and Speculating: The Governance Dilemma of Congressional Stock Trading

The question, therefore, is not whether such trading is legal—it is—but whether legality alone suffices as a safeguard against institutional erosion. Put differently: is the current framework sufficient to preserve the functional and perceived impartiality of the legislative process?

The answer is not self-evident. At the heart of the issue lies a fundamental governance tension: the coexistence of public power and private interest. Public office in the United States is conceptually rooted in a fiduciary model—officials are expected to act as stewards of the public trust, guided by duties of care, loyalty, and impartiality. In this respect, the appearance of impropriety can be as destabilizing to institutional legitimacy as actual misconduct. The Supreme Court has recognized this in *Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.* (2009), holding that due process may be compromised when a decision-maker's impartiality is reasonably in doubt, even absent demonstrable bias.

In the congressional context, this standard raises practical questions. Legislators routinely receive information—through committee assignments, closed briefings, or agency consultations—that may have direct or indirect implications for public companies. While such information may not always meet the technical definition of "material nonpublic information" under securities law, the perception of informational asymmetry remains salient. As a result, the

THE WHITSTONE
LEDGER

Legislating and Speculating: The Governance Dilemma of Congressional Stock Trading

permissibility of congressional stock trading occupies an ambiguous space: legally sanctioned, procedurally transparent (in theory), yet normatively unsettled.

Advocates for reform suggest a categorical prohibition on individual stock ownership or trading by members of Congress and their immediate families. This approach would not preclude participation in broader financial markets—lawmakers could still invest through diversified mutual funds or government-approved blind trusts—but it would sever the direct link between legislative discretion and personal financial exposure. Proponents argue that such a measure would mitigate conflicts of interest, real or perceived, and restore public confidence in congressional impartiality.

Critics of reform offer several counterpoints. First, they argue that members of Congress are entitled to the same economic rights as other citizens, and that blanket restrictions may discourage qualified candidates from seeking office. Second, they question the practicality of alternatives such as blind trusts, citing administrative complexity and uncertain efficacy. Third, they emphasize the role of existing disclosure laws, suggesting that increased enforcement and technological improvements could enhance transparency without imposing categorical bans.

Empirical evidence on the behavioral impact of current rules is limited. While several high-profile incidents—particularly during the early months of the COVID-19 pandemic—have

THE WHITSTONE
LEDGER

Legislating and Speculating: The Governance Dilemma of Congressional Stock Trading

raised concerns about potentially opportunistic trades by lawmakers, systematic analysis is hindered by the opacity of disclosure platforms and the variability of enforcement. Nonetheless, surveys consistently indicate that public trust in Congress is low, and that financial conflicts of interest are widely viewed as contributing factors.

From a policy design perspective, the challenge is not merely to detect wrongdoing, but to prevent the conditions under which it may plausibly arise. Regulatory analogs can be found in other branches: federal judges, for example, are subject to stringent recusal standards; executive branch officials often face robust financial disclosure and divestment obligations. In these contexts, ethical constraints are understood not as punitive, but as foundational to institutional legitimacy.

The legislative path forward is complicated by self-regulation. Any statutory change to congressional trading rules would require action by the very individuals subject to the proposed restrictions. Several bills have been introduced, including the Ban Conflicted Trading Act and the TRUST in Congress Act, but none have advanced beyond committee stages. As such, the impetus for reform, if it is to occur, is likely to come from outside Congress: through sustained media scrutiny, civic mobilization, or judicial engagement with the constitutional dimensions of legislative ethics.

THE WHITSTONE
LEDGER

Legislating and Speculating: The Governance Dilemma of Congressional Stock Trading

Ultimately, the issue invites a broader question about the architecture of democratic governance. Is it institutionally coherent—and publicly sustainable—for lawmakers to retain personal financial exposure to the outcomes of their own policy decisions? Or does such exposure, even when disclosed, introduce an element of asymmetry that undermines the neutrality of legislative power?

There is no universally accepted answer. Some view the practice as an unavoidable byproduct of citizen-legislator governance; others see it as an avoidable threat to fiduciary norms. What remains clear is that the status quo, while legally defensible, is increasingly subject to scrutiny—not solely on ethical grounds, but as a matter of institutional design.

The Constitution does not prohibit congressional stock trading. But neither does it preclude reasonable limitations in the service of transparency and public trust. Whether such limitations should be enacted is a question for policymakers, legal scholars, and the electorate to determine. What cannot be ignored, however, is the broader implication: that in an era of declining civic confidence, the mechanics of self-regulation may require a more rigorous examination than legality alone can provide.