On June 5, 1990, Ethics Commission Staff Attorney Brenda M. Bergeron filed a complaint (Docket No. 90-2) against the American Association of University Professors - CSU. The complaint alleged that the organization failed: 1) to report its fundamental terms of contract entered into in connection with a brochure soliciting other persons to contact state legislators and 2) to report the expenditures for the brochure.

On September 10, 1990 the Ethics Commission and the Respondent settled this matter by entering into a Stipulation and Order (copies of the Complaint and Stipulation are attached). Under the Stipulation, the Respondent admitted violating the Code of Ethics for Lobbyists and agreed to pay a civil penalty of $1,000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CALL:

Brenda M. Bergeron, Esq.
State Ethics Commission
566-4472

Phone: (203) 566-4472
30 Trinity Street • Hartford, Connecticut 06115
An Equal Opportunity Employer
STIPULATION AND ORDER

1. The Commission finds that the Respondent, American Association of University Professors-CSU, violated Conn. Gen. Stat. §1-96 in: 1) failing to report its fundamental terms of contract for the production of a brochure soliciting other persons to contact state legislators to request more funding for higher education and; 2) failing to report its expenditures for such lobbying activity.

2. The Respondent admits that it failed to report the fundamental terms of contract and its expenditures, but states that such failure was negligent and not intentional; and that the Respondent fully intended to report the fundamental terms of contract and its expenditures.

3. The Respondent waives any rights it may have under Conn. Gen. Stat. §§1-93, 1-93a and 1-80 and agrees with the State Ethics Commission to an informal disposition of this matter as permitted by Conn. Gen. Stat. §4-177(c).

WHEREFORE, the State Ethics Commission enters, and the American Association of University Professors-CSU 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 to (1) pay a civil penalty of $1,000 within thirty days; and (2) henceforth, comply with the reporting requirements of the Code of Ethics for Lobbyists.

Paul Weng
American Association of University Professors-CSU

8/30/90
Dated

Chairperson
State Ethics Commission

9/16/90
Dated
CONNECTICUT STATE ETHICS COMMISSION
97 ELM STREET (REAR)
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06106
TELEPHONE NUMBER 566-4472

COMPLAINT

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

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

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

Time and date matters complained of occurred:

March, 1990

Lace violation occurred:

Hartford, Connecticut and New Britain, Connecticut

Names involved:

American Association of University Professors - CSU

Witnesses:

List to be provided prior to any hearing on this matter

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

(see attached)

(over)
Complainant's Name and Address: State Ethics Commission
97 Elm Street (Rear)
Hartford, CT 06106

Complainant's Telephone Number: 566-4472

Date: June 1, 1990
It is hereby alleged that:

1. The American Association of University Professors - CSU (hereinafter the Respondent) is a registrant as that term is defined in Conn. Gen. Stat. §1-91(g).

2. In March of 1990, Respondent made expenditures, as that term is defined in Conn. Gen. Stat. §1-91(f), for solicitations of other persons to communicate with a public official or officials for the purpose of influencing legislative action.

3. Respondent failed to report these expenditures on its lobbyist financial reports.


5. Under Conn. Gen. Stat. §1-96(b), registrants must report the fundamental terms of contracts to make expenditures in furtherance of lobbying on the first monthly or quarterly report due after such a contract is made.

6. Respondent failed to report the fundamental terms of the contract(s) made with regard to the expenditures described in Paragraph Two.