

From: Patel, Swati <SwatiPatel@gov.sc.gov>  
To: Pitts, Ted <TedPitts@gov.sc.gov>  
Veldran, Katherine <KatherineVeldran@gov.sc.gov>  
Date: 3/27/2014 3:09:10 PM  
Subject: FW: H.3945

---

FYI

-----Original Message-----

From: Teague Lynn [mailto:Teague\_L@bellsouth.net]  
Sent: Thursday, March 27, 2014 1:46 PM  
To: Patel, Swati  
Subject: H.3945

Swati,

As you know, H.3945 has finally been referred to Judiciary, although it is not appearing on any schedules yet.

I have been unable to talk with Todd Rutherford to date, but have spoken with several others who don't wish to be quoted by name. It is my understanding that no one is currently pursuing independent investigation at this point. In fact, there seems to be little reason for optimism about this bill on any front. Even if there is some income disclosure in a bill that passes, probable retention of the amendment exempting procedural motions from recusal means the conflict of interest provisions are extremely weak for legislators. The League will have to reassess our support for the bill following the work of the committee and decide whether to give up on H.3945.

The failure of H.3945 to achieve significant changes would leave, as we've discussed, very little on the ethics front for this session. The League supports the clarification of campaign finance in Finlay's bills, but as you've observed they aren't an increase in ethics requirements. They primarily serve to make the existing system less messy and unclear, which is a desirable goal but not a major step forward.

So, we'll see how it goes, but I hear nothing that is encouraging.

Lynn

Sent from my iPad