STATE OF CONNECTICUT
STATE ETHICS COMMISSION

December 13, 1988

PRESS RELEASE

On November 10, 1988, Ethics Commission Staff Attorney Rachel S. Rubin filed complaints (Docket Nos. 88-11, 88-12, 88-13, and 88-14) against Pfizer Inc. and Senators O'Leary, Smith, and Upson. The complaint was filed after an investigation to determine whether the Respondents failed to disclose a fee or honorarium in connection with a Portfolio of State Issues meeting held in Bermuda during April, 1988.

On December 13, 1988, the Ethics Commission and the Respondents settled these matters by entering into Stipulations and Orders, copies of which are attached. As part of the settlement, Pfizer Inc. agreed to pay a fine of $1,000.

During the investigation, it became apparent that there is confusion regarding the Commission's policy on what constitutes a fee or honorarium. Attached is a guide which summarizes the current position of the Commission. In order to educate those required to comply with the relevant reporting requirements of the Code and to clear up any confusion, the Commission intends to distribute this summary and to publish it in its next quarterly newsletter. Senators Smith, Upson and O'Leary have asked for an advisory opinion to formalize this policy.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CALL:

Alan S. Plofsky, Esq.
Executive Director and General Counsel
State Ethics Commission
566-4472

Phone: (203) 366-4472

27 Elm Street — Rear - Hartford, Connecticut 06106

An Equal Opportunity Employer
ETHICS COMMISSION POLICY
REGARDING FEES AND HONORARIA

1. Only those public officials and senior State employees required to file Statements of Financial Interests pursuant to Section 1-83, General Statutes, can accept fees or honoraria offered by virtue of their public positions. Fees and honoraria can be taken for any appearance or the delivery of an address to any meeting of any organization. In each instance, the official or employee must file a disclosure statement with the Ethics Commission within thirty days of receipt of the fee or honorarium. No specific disclosure form is required. A brief letter identifying the donor and event, and describing the benefits received, will suffice.

2. If only necessary expenses (standard transportation to and from the event; standard accommodations, including lodging the night before and/or after the appearance or address; and meals under $50 per person per occasion) are accepted, no disclosure statement is required from the recipient.

3. Anything received over and above the official's or employee's necessary expenses (additional, or unnecessarily lavish, travel, meals, or accommodations; entertainment; expenses of a spouse or other guest of the official; a cash payment; or item of material value) is considered a fee or honorarium by the Ethics Commission, and should be disclosed within thirty days of receipt.

4. Additionally, a registered lobbyist giving a fee or honorarium to a public official or State employee must, on the first lobbyist report due after the event in question, disclose: the date, place, and nature of the event; the recipient(s); the amount of the fee or honorarium; and all related expenses, (which include the necessary expense payments described in paragraph 2, above) whenever the total cost is $15 or more.

5. Lastly, although there is no specific statutory limit on fees and honoraria, the Commission believes they should be modest in nature to avoid any appearance of impropriety.
STIPULATION AND ORDER

1. The Commission finds that the Respondent violated Chapter 10, Part II, General Statutes, as alleged in the attached Complaint.

2. The Respondent does not contest the allegation in the Complaint. Any violation of Section 1-96 was unintentional in that Respondent was unaware that the reporting requirements of Section 1-96(b) of the General Statutes applied to the payment of expenses for a participant and his guest to attend a public policy symposium unrelated to lobbying.

3. The Respondent waives any rights it may have under sections 1-93 and 1-93a, General Statutes and agrees with the State Ethics Commission to an informal disposition of this matter as permitted by subsection 4-177(d), General Statutes.

WHEREFORE, the State Ethics Commission enters, and Pfizer Inc. agrees to, these orders: In lieu of any other action it is authorized to take with respect to this matter, the Commission orders the Respondent within thirty days to (1) file amended client lobbyist financial reports disclosing any previously unreported fees, honoraria or expenses incurred in lieu of honoraria paid during the past three years; (2) pay a civil penalty of $1,000; and (3) henceforth, comply with the reporting requirements of the Code of Ethics for Lobbyists, Chapter 10, Part II, General Statutes and the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies.

[Signatures]

Respondent

Chairperson

State Ethics Commission

Dated 12-9-88

Dated 12-13-88
COMPLAINT

The State Ethics Commission issues a complaint alleging a violation of:

The Code of Ethics for Public Officials and State Employees, Chapter 10, Part I, General Statutes

The Code of Ethics for Lobbyists, Chapter 10, Part II, General Statutes

Time and date matters complained of occurred: April, 1988

Place violation occurred: Hartford, Connecticut, Groton, Connecticut and New York, New York

Persons involved: Pfizer, Inc.

Witnesses: Renee Ross, Senator Thomas F. Upson, Senator Reginald J. Smith, Senator Cornelius O'Leary, Mark Taylor, and Janis Nome

Circumstances which indicate that the Code of Ethics designated above was violated are as follows (a short, plain statement alleging a violation of Chapter 10, General Statutes):

(see attached)
Complainant’s Name and Address:  State Ethics Commission  
97 Elm Street (Rear)  
Hartford, CT 06106

Complainant’s Telephone Number:  566-4472

Signature:  
Date: 11-70-89

Casio Redin
DATE
It is hereby alleged that:

1. In April 1988, Pfizer, Inc., a registrant as defined in subsection 1-91(q), General Statutes, (hereinafter the Respondent) paid the expenses of three legislators and their guests to attend a three-day forum in Bermuda.

2. Respondent did not report any of these expenditures on its lobbying reports.

3. The Respondent's failure to report these expenditures violated subsection 1-96(b), General Statutes, and subsection 1-92-48(b), Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies.