# **JOURNAL**

OF THE

# **SENATE**

OF THE

# STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA



REGULAR SESSION BEGINNING TUESDAY, JANUARY 10, 2023

THURSDAY, APRIL 6, 2023

# Thursday, April 6, 2023 (Statewide Session)

Indicates Matter Stricken Indicates New Matter

The Senate assembled at 11:00 A.M., the hour to which it stood adjourned, and was called to order by the ACTING PRESIDENT, Senator McLEOD. (This is a Statewide Session day established under the provisions of Senate Rule 1B. Members not having scheduled committee or subcommittee meetings may be in their home districts without effect on their session attendance record.)

# ADDENDUM TO THE JOURNAL

The following remarks by Senator SENN were ordered printed in the Journal of January 24, 2023:

# Remarks by Senator SENN

Thank you. I had the good fortune of being one of Senator SETZLER's first pages. I was 18 years old and had no lines on my face. He sent me around -- we got to go knock on doors. Of course, I didn't get paid for that, even though I think we were getting paid \$2 an hour or something and it's not much better now for the pages. But I agreed and we'd go around to all of these neighborhoods and since I was still in high school, I knew half of the people answering the door. So, we're chit chatting and he's at the end of the street saying, "Hurry up, hurry up, we got to go." I said, "I'm promising them you're going to fix these potholes." And he's like -- what? Anyway, it's been a pleasure, Senator, not only when I was your page but also thank you so much for helping guide me even from here in this office.

#### ADDENDUM TO THE JOURNAL

The following remarks by Senator SENN were ordered printed in the Journal of January 25, 2023:

# **Remarks by Senator SENN**

So gentleman, one of the things I'm not sure that a lot of you may realize and that is that women make up 51.4% of South Carolina's population, so we really are not in the minority. Women make up 37.4% of the South Carolina Bar. At the two law schools in our State, women make up 52% of the student body at USC School of Law and 62% at the Charleston School of Law. What you may not know is that South Carolina is about to become the only State in the entire Nation to not

have a female Supreme Court judge and that is embarrassing. It is more embarrassing to me than us being at the bottom of the State with education or having lawyers that don't even understand the separation of powers. That's ridiculous.

Right now, the five members of the Supreme Court are four male and one female. As we know that's going to change -- four white and one black. The black is going to come up next. And let me guess, I know what this Legislature is going to want to do. Let's get a black female -check, check -- two boxes -- and then we'll be nice and balanced. The Court of Appeals -- nine members, one vacancy, five males, three females. A little more balanced there, right? Seven white and one black -- not quite balanced. Then we look at the Circuit Court -- 49 seats; one vacancy and that one is getting ready to go to a male. So, it's going to be 36 males and 13 females. Why is that when we are 37.4% of the Bar? It's because we are not anywhere near balanced in this Legislature. And I may not get to see a change. I'm one of five. Half the time I feel invisible to y'all. I had a colleague yesterday say right in front of my face, that he felt like that Supreme Court race went how it was supposed to go. Was I not standing right there? I had another colleague when we were in the elevator the other day surrounded by a bunch of Democratic males -- I'm the only female in the elevator -- and what does he say, "Let's circle the wagons boys, we're out numbered." Was I there? I want to know, was I there? Then let's look at Family Court. Family Court -- 60 seats; there are three vacancies, 27 males and 30 females. Thank y'all. Thank y'all. Y'all think we're capable only of dealing with Family Court bull crap? Really? That's just embarrassing. It really is.

And then let's look at the makeup of this Body. We have one chairwoman, one chairwoman and what is she over? Family and Veterans' Services. Now, that's by virtue of our rules, so I'm not going to complain about that. Part of the problem is you don't get women that are going to run for the Senate until after they have done their maternal responsibility usually and stayed home and raised all their babies. But we're not so dumb that babies are all that we know. Look across the hall. There is one -- one female chairwoman. Guess what she's over? Education. She runs a preschool, so actually she's probably suited for it, but the only chairwoman ever in the House has been -- there have been two -- two females both over Education. Why is that? I just don't get it. And like I said, I'm probably never going to see a change in how this Body is made up, but my daughter is around, and our daughters are coming, including yours. And I know for a fact that a lot of your wives and your daughters do not agree with you on this issue of abortion. And

here we are on the issue of abortion and we're going to disguise it as rogue justices -- rogue justices -- that makes no sense to me whatsoever.

But I can tell you last Wednesday, the smartest candidate in the whole race dropped out 15 minutes before 12:00, before she could even gather votes. And she, in my opinion, would have been neck and neck right now had she stayed in that race. Because the optics of this, it just -- it is not good. Y'all would be getting heat from all groups around the State had the two women in the race stayed in the race. Because there is nothing, nothing embarrassing about losing. But now what about quitting? And y'all know, I never did lobby a single one of y'all -- not one. But y'all know that the smartest candidate, I believe, would have been a judge who left my partnership 12 years ago. Y'all know this. I never lobbied it. I never mentioned it. I never asked any one of y'all to vote for her because she was my partner. But I fear that her loss is partly my fault because she got painted with a brush that I guess I set forth; because, y'all know my opinion on at least giving a woman through first trimester to make up her mind and to hopefully get her life in order so that she can raise these babies.

But what you didn't look at is that we are defense lawyers. We represent police and first responders. We're conservative. But oh no, y'all did not think her capable of making the decision on her own whether it comported with mine or not. She's her own person, but I fear I caused her to lose. Why? Because I did my job. I told y'all in September what I felt about the issues, and I did my job and now she's prevented from doing hers. But is she prevented? I can't even fuss at this Body for that. She and I have been at each other's throats since she guit last week. Why? Because when she did, 51.4% of the population was let down -- let down. But why did she do it? She's smart and she's tough. She did it because a man told her to -- a man across the street -- he knows who he is. And why she listened to him I will never know because I honestly believe that she could have won this race. And if she didn't, even if she didn't, there would have been no shame in her numbers. But what can I do now? Now we're looking at years with no female justice. And I do appreciate the fact that y'all are turning this into an abortion discussion because at least now we know it really isn't about the smartest judge or the best candidate. It is about who you think it is going to demand forced birth. That's what this is.

I just -- I really -- I don't even know what to say beyond the fact that you should all be embarrassed. We should be embarrassed, me too, that we have allowed this to happen. We have allowed it to happen and why? What's the real reason we allowed it to happen? Because somebody over

in the House is scared of seventeen clowns that are basically yanking his chain. Seventeen clowns are what this is about. And it ends up impacting one of the most serious judicial races -- the most serious that I've been a part of. And everybody keeps talking to me about down ballots and stuff. I don't even care about the down ballots at this point. I just really don't, but for y'all to sit here and say we need to change up the elections and you want to have every qualified person come out and be a candidate. If we're going to do that can we please make some type of rule that they don't have to slink about in the lobby and suck up to us at the ropes and beg for appointments with us? Because we're going to have so many more candidates. My gosh, I run up these back stairs whenever the judicial races are going on because it is just too much. And also, while I'm ranting, please don't give judicial candidates my cell phone number. I mean why? That infuriates me. If they know me, they're going to have my number. If they don't, I don't want anybody giving it to them.

There is nothing wrong with the way our system is. I know that this is a good point for everybody to say JMSC is bad, but the reality is lawyers know the other lawyers who are running, and lawyers know the best lawyers for the job. We usually know their temperament. We usually know what they're thinking or what their thought process might be. But for this Legislature, supermajority Republican Party, supersupermajority men to sit here and say, oh, we had a judge who was the swing judge and therefore he is rogue, and we need to implement some type of procedure to rope him in and while we're at it, hey, the right thing happened -- when it happened that our two female candidates backed out. I'm ashamed of that and I'm ashamed about a lot. But one of the things I'm most ashamed about is the next two years with no women and we remain invisible.

\*\*\*

# ADDENDUM TO THE JOURNAL

The following remarks by Senator SETZLER were ordered printed in the Journal of March 14, 2023:

# Remarks by Senator SETZLER

Mr. PRESIDENT, ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, it is an honor that I, as the Chairman of the Economic Development subcommittee of the Senate Finance Committee, am asked to speak about this project. There is one word that describes this project -- transformational -- not only to the Midlands of South Carolina but also to the State of South

Carolina. This project will transform the Midlands of South Carolina, and it will continue the transformation of South Carolina overall.

We are now known as an automobile manufacturing mecca across the Southeast. What we have produced speaks to our accomplishments. Think about the vision, the tenacity and the courage you, as individual members of the South Carolina Senate, and your predecessors have to bring these companies to South Carolina. Think about Michelin and BMW in the Upstate; Volvo in the Low Country; and now you will have Scout Motors as backed by Volkswagen in the Midlands.

You have Michelin, you have Bridgestone in Aiken, you have Continental in Sumter -- all are world-class tire companies. Economic development news from today announced a new tire company locating in Allendale County with more than a thousand jobs. You have Boeing in Charleston. You have fighter jets made in Greenville. You have Amazon -- these are world-class companies that have located in our State that bring prosperity. They bring jobs. They bring economic development. They bring commerce to small businesses of South Carolina. We are now adding another giant to the inventory of companies in South Carolina.

\*\*\*

# ADDENDUM TO THE JOURNAL

The following remarks by Senator SCOTT were ordered printed in the Journal of March 14, 2023:

# **Remarks by Senator SCOTT**

Mr. PRESIDENT, members of the Senate, I can't tell you how much this project means to the northeast and Blythewood which is part of Senate District 19. Let me say that we didn't just wake up one day and all the pieces came together. For the last thirty-five years I've represented that total community. Let me tell you a little bit about that community which makes all these pieces fall in place. You heard a lot about the K-12 education in which we have an abundance of high schools in that area -- Richland Northeast, Eau Claire, Columbia High, Keenan, Spring Valley, Westwood, Ridgeview, Dutch Fork and others that make up the other locations in Richland County. So, we do have that infrastructure. We need to make sure that the training force is actually there. But outside just the K-12 training force, let me also say we represent several colleges just in District 19 -- Columbia College, Lutheran Seminary, Columbia International, South University -- I'm going to stop at Midlands Tech because Midlands Tech this time is doing something under the leadership

of Dr. Ron Rhames that probably never has been done before in the State. This new training facility is not built at Midlands Tech. It's actually built on the Tech site. But you see, there are two other additional technical schools that are going to also be impacted by Scout coming to South Carolina -- that's Orangeburg Regional Tech, led by Dr. Walter Tobin and also Denmark Tech, lead by Dr. Willie Todd.

How important is this? I have shared with you over and over again the twenty-two counties who have lost population. Our challenge will be how many of those counties that lost population -- also counties in the surrounding areas -- those counties that are going to be affected by this plant. Let me just first back up a little bit. Richland County -- that area has a 2.9% unemployment rate. I share with you lots of times what the income levels were like in that area. Salaries in that area are \$50,000 to \$200,000 approximately, 21,000 individuals who already have the income this factory will probably allow. Hospitals and services -- you can't grow these companies and organizations without having better health care. Probably the only location with three hospitals -- three of the largest hospitals in that area -- Prisma, Lexington and MUSC. Also, we have Fairfield Electric and Dominion. So, we are highly efficient in terms of meeting those challenges. We also talked about the railway system coming that's going to help us to get the freight out and be able to get it where it needs to be. It's also surrounded by US 21, US 321, I 77 into I-20, I-26, Hwy 555 and of course Monticello Road -- all these roads lead to somewhere -- let me tell you a little bit about where they lead to. They lead to approximately fifteen counties that sit in the region. I'm talking about the Central Midlands Region. I want to talk about the region itself -- that region which also includes Aiken County, which is about fifty miles away. Barnwell County which has been struggling, which is about sixty-two miles away, Calhoun County is about thirtyone miles away, Chester County is forty-five miles away, Clarendon County is fifty-three miles and Fairfield County is right at the back door which was hit by a major utility closure real hard. Kershaw County is forty miles away, Lancaster County is forty-six miles away, Lee County is forty-three miles away, Lexington County, and you've heard a lot from Senator SETZLER, as well Newberry County is thirty-eight miles away. You've heard from Senator HUTTO, which is about thirty-nine miles away. Saluda County is forty-five miles away. Sumter County is forty miles away and Union County is fifty-six miles away. All of these counties will be affected by this plant. And what we're hoping is that we get a lot of people who come into the region but also we're hoping these folk are able to go back into their homes, continue to develop their

homes, because this makes a difference in terms of whether or not they continue to create a local tax base and continue to do some of the things that need to get done.

We have a ton of automobile dealers which will also be affected by the growth of this company coming in from BMW, Jim Hudson, Buick of the Midlands, Toyota, Nissan, Volkswagen and Honda. We have what a major corporation would look for high income, educated community, high income housing. This plant is dropped right in the middle of these middle-income communities, not just one, but several communities. We are looking forward to what this corporation is going to do for the Midlands. We think it's a powerful tool -- it's not a perfect tool -- but we think it's a powerful tool that could help fix a lot of the surrounding counties.

So, I hope you don't just look at this project as a Midlands project. This is a regional project that expands even beyond the region to help a lot of communities that are in dire straits, especially in terms of losing population. We also are hoping that this company will bring the spin-off of the smaller manufacturing company -- parts companies and others will come -- not necessarily just located in Richland County, but also located in some of these other surrounding counties. As you put that infrastructure together, working in conjunction with the seven HBCUs and what they're doing with the SCIII Institute and making sure that these pieces all come together to help these small surrounding counties.

\*\*\*

# ADDENDUM TO THE JOURNAL

The following remarks by Senator HARPOOTLIAN were ordered printed in the Journal of March 15, 2023:

# Remarks by Senator HARPOOTLIAN

I am one who scours the newspaper every morning. I actually have a paper; I am one of those old time folks that like to hold the paper when I read it. I find that I see things that I do not see when I read the news on my telephone. I read with interest this morning that in the House of Representatives a Bill was introduced this week that would provide the death penalty for women who get an abortion. Now as you know, I am a proponent of the death penalty, but I think it should be used sparingly. I read the Bill and wondered how one would come to such a decision. By the way, the Bill had twenty-one sponsors and in one day it is down to sixteen, so support is quickly eroding for this proposition. But it said to me, maybe I should go look at this. So I did a little research and found

that in Afghanistan, where the Taliban rule, the maximum penalty for an abortion is seven years. In Iran, where the Ayatollah rules, the maximum penalty for an abortion is two years. As a matter of fact, the only sentence of death I could find for an abortion was in 1944, the Vichy government, the Nazi government in France, passed a law making abortion punishable by death. And a woman was actually put to death by the guillotine in 1944. This Google thing is just wonderful, is it not? In scouring the records, I found that was the only instance. So I said to myself, what is the goal? Is the goal to be tougher than the Taliban? Really? Really? So, I began looking at more about this Bill and we are getting national press on it. I know that helps Senator PEELER recruit industry to come to South Carolina, the only State in the country with the death penalty, or proposed death penalty for abortion. Obviously, I am being a little bit facetious here.

I understand it is that other Body across the hall, and we know they pass Bills, and we pass laws. I get all of that. But it seems to me, that there is something going on over there. I watched the budget process this week -- I would call it juvenile if not for the fact that there are twentyone votes over there to do all kind of wacky things, including this. So, I wanted to bring it to your attention -- I looked at the list of sponsors, those that are still sponsors, and found a number of them are in your districts -- none in mine, thank God, but in a number of your districts. And I want to share with you their names. The next time you run into them you may suggest that perhaps they are on the wrong track, that they are not heading in the right direction and that they perhaps need to refocus their efforts. There is water, there is sewer, there are developments, investment, there are taxes -- there are all kind of things we need to deal with -- this is not one of them. Sponsors of this Bill are Representative Robert J. "Rob" Harris, District 36-Spartanburg, Representative James Mikell "Mike" Burns, District 17-Greenville, Representative William M. "Bill" Chumley, District 35-Greenville and Spartanburg, Representative Jordan S. Pace, District 117-Berkeley, Representative Roger Nutt, District 34-Spartanburg, Representative Thomas Beach, District 10-Anderson, Greenville, and Pickens, Representative Stewart Jones, District 14-Laurens, Representative Joseph S. "Joe" White, District 40-Lexington and Newberry, Representative Steven Wayne Long, District 37-Spartanburg, Representative David O'Neal, District 66-York, Representative Josiah Magnuson, District 38-Spartanburg, Representative Donald Ryan McCabe, Jr., District 96-Lexington, Representative Ashley Trantham, District 28-Greenville, Representative John Gregory "Jay" Kilmartin,

District 85-Lexington, Representative Brandon Guffey, District 48-York, and Representative April Cromer, District 6-Anderson. These are the folks in your districts espousing this position. Whether you are prochoice or pro-life, the death penalty, really? Really? If you talk to some of the responsible folks, mostly Republicans, in the House, they will tell you these folks are not interested in governing; they are interested in terrorism. Maybe that is why they are tougher than the Taliban on abortion. And by the way, both in Iran and Afghanistan, there are exceptions to save the mother's life or for fetal abnormalities. So I point out, even where Sharia Law is in effect, it is not as tough as what these Representatives want.

\*\*\*

#### ADDENDUM TO THE JOURNAL

The following remarks by Senator GROOMS were ordered printed in the Journal of March 15, 2023:

# Remarks by Senator GROOMS

Members of the Senate, I rise today to share with you a report that was just placed on the desk of every member of the Senate. The report has now been publicly released and it is no easy task to stand here to give you a summary of this report. This is a report of the constitutional subcommittee of the Senate Finance Committee. The subcommittee members are Senator McELVEEN, Senator GOLDFINCH, Senator FANNING, and Senator YOUNG.

On February 9th, Comptroller General Richard Eckstrom appeared before the Finance Committee's constitutional subcommittee for his annual budget hearing. At the meeting General Eckstrom mentioned, almost in passing that his office has determined that there was a \$3.5 billion misstatement in the state surplus fund. That afternoon, Chair of the Finance Committee, Chairman PEELER, directed the constitutional subcommittee to do a deep dive into the Comptroller General's admission. While there are some things the Comptroller was never able to fully understand, there is much we do now know. We know the next best step. We know what needs to be done. And in a moment, I'll ask you to help ensure that the right thing is done. But first some background. The Comptroller General compiles the annual comprehensive financial report. That's this document right here. According to the Comptroller General, this annual comprehensive financial report, or the ACFR provides financial information about the statement's operations during the year and describes its financial position at the end of the year. The

Comptroller further assured us that this report, and I quote, "Management, that is the Comptroller, fully assumes full responsibility for the completeness and reliability of the information contained in this report." Based on a comprehensive framework of internal controls, that was established for this purpose. The last ACFR for this year ending June 30th, 2022, is over 300 pages. The above quotes and report are given under his hand and signed Richard Eckstrom, C.P.A., Comptroller General unfortunately despite this assertation, the subcommittee finds that the internal controls use in the compiling of ACFR are not comprehensive, and the ACFR is neither complete nor reliable. The Comptroller overstated South Carolina's cash and investments by over \$3.5 billion. But for the record, let us correct that. The erroneous figure is actually in excess of \$4 billion. That's because we later learned the Comptroller overstated overall fund balances by \$3.5 billion, he understated fund balances at the DOT by \$500 million, and it seems that someone thought that \$3.5 billion seemed less problematic than \$4 billion. Anyway, this morning we learned that the Comptroller never even told the DOT about the DOT understatement.

At its most basic level, the problem is the Comptroller was double counting funds. While most state agencies use the South Carolina automated enterprise system, known as SCEIS, one-time accounting commissions are known as lump sum agencies that use other accounting systems. These are appropriated agencies but lump sum agencies have their own accounting systems and are audited separately. An example would be Clemson University, the State Ports Authority, Santee Cooper -- not included as part of the SCEIS system, but what they do at the end of close of their year -- they have audited financial statements. Those audited financial statements are then transmitted to the Comptroller General at the Comptroller General's request. He sends out an information packet that they must fill out with all sorts of information to help the Comptroller compile the annual comprehensive financial statement. These non-SCEIS agencies, it appears, that the Comptroller had been double counting cash, that is -- we would appropriate, let's say, \$100 million to Clemson. Clemson would get the \$100 million, deposit it, they may spend \$50 million of it, in their budget. At the end of the year, their financial statement would show \$50 million in cash. The Comptroller General would report \$100 million as their cash. If he had done the same thing to the University of South Carolina -- we sent them \$100 million -- let's say they spent \$50 million, their financial statement shows \$50 million remaining in cash, but the Comptroller General would combine those two showing that there were \$200 million left in cash.

The ACFR has been incorrect every year for the past ten years with an incorrect cash balance growing every year. There has been attempt to reconcile this. The last attempt was in 2017 with \$1.3 billion adjustment to the state finances. The explanation then was that we were moving away from an old accounting system called STARS and we were moving into the new accounting system called SCEIS. The two accounting systems ran in tandem for a period of five years to make sure that one was right with the other. But once we got fully on SCEIS, there was a large cash balance that no one could explain. So, the Comptroller General charged it off as a one-time expense due to a conversion error. The problem is, it continued and continued and continued until the problem was so big that it could no longer be ignored. For years the Comptroller knew that that was a cash problem. He knew that something was wrong. He, in testimony before the subcommittee, called this the long-standing riddle. Although later in testimony, he tells us that he first knew about the problem -- and I believe what he meant to say was he knew exactly what the problem was. He knew there was a cash problem but didn't know exactly what it was until October. He hired someone from the Treasurer's Office, and I believe he told us in testimony that she was hired specifically to try to find the problem. And she did. After two years working there, she discovered what was deemed a mapping error or an account error in the way the accounts worked. So, when Clemson would get \$100 million, lump sum appropriation from the State of South Carolina, there should have been a corresponding decrease of \$100 million. Monies came into the State and monies went to the college. \$100 million came in. \$100 million went out. The account should have zeroed out. At the end of the year, after Clemson spent \$50 million, their financial statement would have said they had \$50 million in cash. The Comptroller should have then taken that \$50 million, from Clemson, and the other cash balances in the other non-SCEIS agencies and added them all together, to come up with a cash position. He did not do that. He double counted money. Monies came in and were never accounted for when it went back out which overstated our state's cash position by over \$4 billion.

Now, why is that a problem? Well, in the history of accounting errors, this is probably one of the largest, if not, the largest accounting error. A lot of people depend on the accuracy of this report. Namely, the rating agencies in New York that grade our bonds. Our AAA Credit Rating enables us to enjoy the lowest possible interest payments on monies that we borrow. Lots of monies -- a lot of bonding -- a lot of bonds have been issued. A lot of bound counsels are very interested in what happens to

the value of their bonds. It just so happened in 2022 when the books were closed, instead of having \$10.5 billion, the rating agencies were notified we only had \$7 billion in cash -- total cash among the State of South Carolina. That would have sent alarms, except for the fact that so much money came into the State that same year. In your business you know there are two statements that you look at to judge your financial health or to judge the finances of your business. The State is sort of the same way. There is what's called the balance sheet. And then there is your profit and loss or your income statement. Profit and loss statement is sort of like what we do here when we do the annual appropriations. We estimate what revenues are coming into the State, then there are expenses, or budgeted items. We believe that there will be \$10 billion coming into the State, so we will base our budget on \$10 billion -- we appropriate \$10 billion. We estimate ten comes in, we appropriate ten. If it all works out the same, if the numbers come in, as projected, ten will come in and ten will go out. And the amount that we had in the bank at the beginning of the year and the ending of the year will remain the same. That would be an asset. Your cash is an asset. That's what appears on the balance sheet. The balance sheet for the State is what's in this report. The balance sheet said that we had \$10.5 billion in cash. When, in fact, we only had \$7 billion. But last year, if you remember, there were a lot of appropriations from the federal government that flowed through the State of South Carolina. Yesterday we sent over to the House of Representatives \$1.2 billion of those monies that we had carried over. There were other revenues that came into the State. So, in a year, where we tell the New York rating agencies that we underestimated cash -- that we only had \$7 billion in cash -- we still ended the year with \$10 billion. That is, we had \$3.5 billion, almost the same amount as the misstatement, sitting in bank accounts. So as far as they're concerned, they're looking at the beginning of the year, that was corrected, and the end of the year -as it actually happened -- to be about the same amount -- \$10.5 billion. No monies have been taken. No monies have been stolen. We're not missing any monies. We just had our chief financial officer misstate our cash position. We were tasked with finding out what happened. Will this occur again? We brought in the Comptroller General, placed him under oath -- and as some of the subcommittee members -- I asked if they would please give me one or two words to describe the testimony of Comptroller General Eckstrom -- his testimony under oath. And in their own words, here is how they described it -- confusing, bizarre, concealed, nonchalant, cavalier, evasive, and incoherent. We find him incapable of answering the questions we asked with any confidence of

certainty. I want to thank the subcommittee members for their work. No one went in this with any preconceived notions. We gave the Comptroller the benefit of the doubt. We asked questions in a different way. We repeated the questions. We asked for clarifications. We joined with in-person hearings, and we watched and rewatched tapes. One member had legal pads filled with notes, but the bewildering testimony continued on and on and on. Not until relatively late in our investigation did we get some straight answers.

In one of the meetings the Comptroller turned to a staffer, a person who ultimately figured it all out, she told us about the duplicated reporting. She was also the one who found the solution and has made the correction that has been noted. The single greatest relief, the most welcoming testimony, was from that staffer who told us that after she figured it out, she was able to reconcile the state's books to 49 cents. On the other hand, among the most, and frankly cringe-worthy testimony was related to whether the Comptroller would have hired an attorney. He was point blank asked, "Have you hired an attorney?" The committee had unequivocal evidence that an attorney himself had been hired. The attorney had sent that information to the Senate Finance Committee to inform us that he had been retained by Comptroller General Eckstrom. He flatly denied hiring an attorney. You have a portion of that testimony also on your desks.

The Comptroller's job is well defined. Several statutes outline his role as the state's chief accountant. He himself says, on his website, that he is the chief financial watchdog. Further, per proviso 96.2 of the 2014 Appropriations Act, the Comptroller General is given full power and authority to issue accounting policy directives to state agencies in order to comply with generally accepted accounting principles. Additionally, the Comptroller is given full authority to conduct surveys, acquire consulting services, and to implement new procedures required to implement full changes required by the generally accepted accounting principles. This proviso has been in the appropriations act each fiscal year since 2014 and can be found in the most recent appropriations act as proviso 97.2. The Comptroller General is the person where the buck stops when it comes to reporting the state's finances and reporting them accurately. We had testimony from the State Treasurer, we had testimony from the state's auditor. We had testimony from Marsha Adams with the Department of Administration. Every one of them let us know that the problem lies with the Comptroller General's office. The Comptroller General let us all know under oath that the problem was not him. The problem was everybody else. The problem was with the

Comptroller's office. The problem was with the auditor's office. The problem was everywhere but his office, even though he is the one charged with executing and producing documents such as this that not only we rely on, but others rely on.

Therefore, in view of the above, it is the collective opinion of the subcommittee that certain actions take place. Number one, that the Comptroller General, Richard Eckstrom has repeatedly demonstrated his inability to perform statutory duties of the office of which he was elected. We also believe that the Comptroller should be relieved of the duties of his office. We believe that the General Assembly should begin proceedings to remove the Comptroller from office pursuant to Title 15, Section 3 of the Constitution of South Carolina for willful neglect of duty or other reasonable care -- which shall not be sufficient grounds of impeachment. The House has introduced Articles of Impeachment. I don't believe criminal activity occurred. I believe there was willful neglect of duty. I think we demonstrated that. This is a very comprehensive, 80-page report, every finding is footnoted and the testimony is footnoted. We also believe the responsibility of the Office of Comptroller General be given to other offices of the State. We believe that the Senate Finance Committee should recommend which offices of the State should receive those responsibilities. And we believe that the General Assembly should advance an amendment to the Constitution of the State of South Carolina to remove the Comptroller as an elected official. With that, Mr. PRESIDENT, I would be happy to answer any questions.

Senator FANNING: Senator do you know I thank you for your leadership on this? Did you know that I also thank the Chairman of Senate Finance, who the second you shared with him what happened, focused like a laser beam on finding out what the problem was, who to hold accountable and what steps to take to make sure this never happens again. Would you believe that that's what we've done?

Senator GROOMS: Yes, I believe we have done that.

Senator FANNING: And before I move to the next one, could you speak to our unbelievable staff that worked countless hours, emailing us at 2:00 in the morning on a weekend?

Senator GROOMS: I would like to recognize, Jessa Wiginton, if you can stand. She has worked night and day and she has work weekends correlating all the testimony and other documents that have been provided to the committee. She has done well and beyond the call of duty, and I thank her, and the subcommittee thanks her.

Senator FANNING: Do you think the Body knows that this is her first time in this new role, first time inheriting a Senate Finance Committee and on top of our committee meetings having to do this on top of -- we all appreciate her, did you know?

Senator GROOMS: I do know that.

Senator FANNING: Yes.

Senator GROOMS: I do know that.

Senator FANNING: And did you know that when I say we got emails from her on a Saturday night or Sunday morning at 2:00 in the morning,

did you know that that is the truth? Senator GROOMS: Yes, I do know.

Senator FANNING: And was this vote unanimous in subcommittee?

Senator GROOMS: This was the unanimous vote of the subcommittee.

Senator FANNING: Did you know that I appreciate the work of you making sure this is a bipartisan look, not a witch hunt, but defining the facts, as they were in the case, in the testimony. Is it true that we started without swearing in, and that after some confusing thoughts, we then moved quickly to swearing in, is that correct?

Senator GROOMS: We normally don't swear in witnesses, and after our first budget hearing, when the Comptroller made the admission of a \$3.5 billion error, and then was unable to answer questions, was unable to give us the right timelines, we carried over his testimony. And then in subsequent meetings, we had him and any other witness placed under oath. And during that meeting, I do want the Body to know and hear this, that at the first meeting when he talked about an error -- When did he know about it? What did he do about it? He told us, "I knew about it in October, and I informed the Governor and legislative leadership in October." And then when we asked, well, who did you speak to in legislative leadership? Who specifically did you speak to? He could not give us a name. And he said, "Well, it may have been in November." We find out now, that he had conversations with Senate Finance Committee staff but they didn't occur until January of this year. It is amazing the misinformation that we received. The Comptroller was either unable or unwilling to answer basic questions related to his job, how this occurred, and how he operates his office.

Senator FANNING: So, would it be true that not only did he not take responsibility in the situation that happened -- is that we were getting confusing information on things that really weren't even a criminal act. We were just -- isn't it true, just trying to find basic things -- what happened, when it happened, who he talked to.

Senator GROOMS: Although it is without question that it is the responsibility of the Comptroller, only the Comptroller can create a code within the new SCEIS system. I say new -- it has been around now for a while -- only the Comptroller can, even though he tried to deflect blame on the mapping and coding issues elsewhere. There are a number of things that only the Comptroller can do. And he told our committee that he does not except responsibility for the problem, but he accepts responsibility for the solution. One thing, and you'll also see this in our report, and we heard this under testimony, under sworn testimony from the Treasurer -- we suspected as much. But sometimes shortcuts occur. Staff sometimes at the Comptroller's office feel pressure to produce documents, when they say, and we have seen these in internal emails also included in our report, that sometimes there have been some shortcuts. We need more time to do this, but there is a short timeline. We need to produce this now, but we need more time to make sure it is accurate. It seems that the Comptroller was more interested in personal vanity in receiving awards than he was in the accuracy of his reporting.

Senator FANNING: Could you describe in the thick packets we received, asking for a timeline what you found – on one page in the middle of all of that -- we were worried about transparency and openness, and accountability, and when we didn't get it from testimony -- did you find a certain certificate included in a packet?

Senator GROOMS: There is a certain certificate included in our comprehensive report, that we've laid on everybody's desk. It appears on page 79 of the 80-page report. It was also included in our state's annual comprehensive financial report. The Comptroller General thought everyone should know that he does excellent work. So much so, that he included his -- I kid you not -- his certificate of achievement in excellence in financial reporting. The award was more important than the accuracy of the report.

Senator FANNING: Speak a little bit about the timeline. I don't want to belabor this, but I think the timeline is so important. We didn't know until early February and the Governor's office didn't know until December. But do you remember that in 2017, he was warned that the books were off then by I believe it was \$1.3 billion, and did he contact any of us in 2017 to let us know that the error was beginning to accumulate?

Senator FANNING: And so, is it true, he waited until we think maybe a staffer brought it to him, and then he knew in October, I believe we were told, and then took it to the Governor's office to share in November? One of the most enlightening points, did you know, was when we were worried about that bond rating. You mentioned earlier that one of the

reasons, this is critical, people would say if the money is not missing why is it important? Did you know that we believe that if your job is to be the state's auditor, you being accurate at auditing is important. But did he not share in testimony, and the Treasurer's office I believe shared in testimony, that he talked to the bonding agencies at the New York Stock Exchange in October of last year about would this impact their bond rating, which means they knew before we knew. Is that not correct?

Senator GROOMS: He contacted the three ratings agencies. Normally the person who has contact with the rating agencies to report on the state's finances is the State Treasurer. The State Treasurer has an ongoing relationship with the bonding agencies, with the rating agencies -- not the Comptroller. But the Comptroller felt the need to pick up the phone and give them a call to say, listen you all, there has been a mistake but don't worry, it is all good. And then he told us that the bonding rate -- the bonding agencies seem to be okay with it. That they didn't seem to -- that they thanked him for giving them a call.

Senator FANNING: It is what he told us at the meeting.

Senator GROOMS: And we have internal communications that Moody's Analytics had serious questions and concerns related to the misstatement, despite General Eckstrom's testimony to the contrary.

Senator FANNING: And did you know while that's scary, what was even more scary, is that he shared with folks on the New York Stock Exchange information before he shared anything with the Finance Chairman, the Governor, and the Treasurer himself. Isn't that scary?

Senator GROOMS: The information was first shared with those outside of the State before it was shared with those inside of the State.

Senator FANNING: And speak to the sense of urgency-- because your report, that you issued today, on behalf of the committee that was passed unanimously, talks about going forward with what we should feel safe in doing, and why we need to make changes. We've already stated that he took no responsibility for what happened in the past but is ready to take responsibility in the future. What sense of urgency did the committee hear from him that would make us feel good about making sure this problem wouldn't happen again? Was there a sense of urgency in his responses?

Senator GROOMS: The committee requested information. The letter is in your packet in the report. There was a response to some of the questions, so we did receive some information, but most of what we requested has still not been forwarded to the Senate Finance Committee staff. So, there are still questions that we had posed and documents that we requested that we have not yet received.

Senator FANNING: That's why I feel so good about the hard work you put us through on the committee -- working us to death. Holding people accountable is one thing but fixing it so it doesn't happen again is even more important -- speaking to the integrity of faith that we might have with the general taxpayers, would you not agree?

Senator GROOMS: I certainly would agree with that. And if you remember, also, under testimony, the Comptroller tried to blame the state's internal auditor and the external auditor -- Remy Osmore with CliftonLarsonAllen. CliftonLarsenAllen -- the State contracts with them for auditing services -- and the State Auditor, George Kennedy. They both testified under oath, noting that they had reported in each of the last ten years to the Comptroller General material weaknesses within the Comptroller General's office. Citing weak internal controls in their audits of the office, that there is a lack of appropriate and robust quality controls in the annual comprehensive financial report. And they repeatedly noted that there were a lack of assurances, and there were inadequate reviews of documents necessary to ensure that this report is accurate and consistent. Every year except for 2018, for the past ten years, the state's auditor issued reports to the Comptroller General's office citing deficiencies in their work. They've even testified had there been more staff, they would probably have caught this a lot earlier. When the Comptroller General took office there were seventy employees. Today there are now twenty-six. And every year on his web page, he likes to speak about how much money he's been able to save the taxpayers -- how he's able to do more with less. I submit, that he does less with less. And that his work has possibly endangered the AAA Credit Rating of the State. The only saving grace was the amount of new revenues we had coming into the State that year and how we had shepherded them. And how the ending balance of the State was still close to the \$10.5 billion as was the erroneous beginning balance of \$10.5 billion, which had to be restated. So, during the ratio analysis, and the other tests that the rating agencies do, we still had cash reserves, sufficient probably, to maintain our AAA Credit Rating, but that is still yet to be determined. The rating agencies could possibly give us a downgrade. I don't know that they will. Probably not, because our cash revenues are high -- we budget conservatively -- and the state's economy seems to be doing well. So, all those things factor in. But if there had been a downgrade or if there is a downgrade, the million, the tens of millions or the hundreds of millions of dollars in bonds that are outstanding would be less than what they would be otherwise. If you buy a bond for a thousand dollars, and all sudden the bond's only worth \$900. The value of that bond decreased

because of the credit worthiness of the one who issued the bond -- you would be upset.

Senator FANNING: Yes.

Senator GROOMS: Bond council would then probably file a lawsuit because their value had decreased. They lost money because of the actions of someone else. So, it is important to maintain our AAA Credit Rating to receive the lowest possible interest on the bonds we issue. But it is also important that we have accurate financing so that through dereliction of duty we don't end up having a loss of our AAA Credit Rating such that we open ourselves up to liability from bond council of the various bond issued.

Senator FANNING: You mentioned just a couple of questions. \$3.5 billion is the figure we have learned, you mentioned it earlier -- it is actually \$4 billion. We just got blessed, is it not correct, that one of the \$500 million errors subtracted from the larger, is that correct?

Senator GROOMS: Not only is that correct, if you look in our comprehensive report of the subcommittee, on page 45, you'll even see a draft of a \$4.4 billion restatement that the staff and the Comptroller discussed. We found this in email documents -- that they almost put this draft into the comprehensive financial report. Instead of showing a \$3.5 billion misstatement, here is an actual draft of a \$4.4 billion restatement. After discussing it, they thought it would look better if we sent the rating agencies a \$3.5 billion restatement.

Senator FANNING: Last question. It's important, and a lot of people will focus today on the removal of office portion. But did you know that the majority of citizens don't know what the Comptroller General does when we vote for them on a ballot. And that another recommendation the committee is giving is that this become an appointed position -- that might be the only way to make sure that we hire a professional we can hold accountable and do what other states have done. Is that not also important?

Senator GROOMS: That's important. And this is serious business we're talking about -- undoing an election. But we've heard sworn testimony. And this sworn testimony is available online for anyone to listen to. We have over six and a half hours of testimony, I believe, from the Comptroller General alone. Anyone who watches only ten minutes of his testimony would begin to have questions about his abilities. You listen to some of the answers, and you'll begin to have questions about his ability to discharge the duties of his office. You listen to all of his testimony and there will be no doubt in anyone's mind that he does not

have the ability to discharge the duties of the office to which he was elected.

PRESIDENT ALEXANDER: Senator Campsen, for what purpose do you rise?

Senator CAMPSEN: Would the Senator yield?

PRESIDENT ALEXANDER: Time has expired. Senator?

Senator GROOMS: Unanimous consent to give the Senator ten more minutes

PRESIDENT ALEXANDER: Is there objection to ten minutes? Hearing none, so ordered. Senator from Charleston.

Senator CAMPSEN: Senator, there are two ways to remove a public official from office under our State Constitution. Is that correct?

Senator GROOMS: That's correct.

Senator CAMPSEN: And the House has chosen the procedure which everyone is familiar with, generally speaking, that's impeachment. And impeachment is under Article 15, Section 1 of our Constitution. But you're recommending another process. What is the difference between impeachment and the process you are recommending, which also is in Article 15, Section 3?

Senator GROOMS: Yes, Article 15, Section 3 of the Constitution allows for a provision, where a two-third vote of both bodies can remove an elected official for willful neglect of duty or other reasonable cause which shall not be sufficient grounds of impeachment.

Senator CAMPSEN: So, this provides for removal on grounds that don't have to rise to the level of impeachment. Is that correct?

Senator GROOMS: That's correct.

Senator CAMPSEN: To impeach an official in South Carolina it must be serious crimes, according to Section 1, Article 15 -- Section 1, serious crimes, or serious misconduct. But in Section 3, this other removal process, the standard is willful neglect of duty. A lower standard doesn't have to be a crime just a neglect of duty or other reasonable cause. And so, this is a lower standard for removal than impeachment requires. Is that right, Senator?

Senator GROOMS: It is a lower standard, but this is a well documented report we placed on everybody's desk. I think there is more than ample evidence that we have more than ample testimony to meet the threshold of removal.

Senator CAMPSEN: And the threshold is willful neglect or other reasonable cause and reasonable is in the mind of the General Assembly, right? Because we're the ones who vote on whether we remove or not.

Senator GROOMS: One of the most egregious things that the Comptroller has done was ignore the warnings that were issued annually for the last ten years that there could be a serious misstatement in the state's financial document if internal controls are not changed. They documented internal weaknesses. And the Comptroller under sworn testimony last week said he was surprised to learn that the auditors had issues with his internal controls -- when it is documented and the documents are also included in pages 61 through 66 of our report that is laid on everyone's desk -- of the repeated warnings that something bad could happen if you don't change your controls. And what the Comptroller did, instead of beefing up his controls -- other staff was still let go and not replaced -- going from seventy employees down to I believe it is twenty-six now, or maybe twenty-three.

Senator CAMPSEN: So Senator, the House proposed the impeachment route.

Senator GROOMS: Not only imposed the impeachment route in the annual appropriations act just voted on by the House but they reduced the salary by a vote of 107 to 6 of the Comptroller General to a dollar a year.

Senator CAMPSEN: And impeachment involves impeachment by the House by a two-thirds vote, and then a trial in the Senate. Is that correct that the House members would actually have a trial before us in the Senate. Then the Senate would have to vote two-thirds vote to impeach and remove him from office?

Senator GROOMS: That's how that would work. That's how the impeachment would work. The Comptroller, as I've said earlier, and in the report, was completely unable to answer basic questions. He was just not able to. No matter what you asked him, he couldn't do it. You ask him how something happened -- he couldn't explain it.

Senator CAMPSEN: But one reason that we're proposing to proceed under Section 3 of Article 15, instead of Section 1, which is impeachment, is that may not necessarily rise to the level of a serious crime, which is what is required for impeachment under Article 1 of Section 15.

Senator GROOMS: I would like to quote editorial writer Cindi Ross Scoppe. She opined about this in Sunday's Post and Courier. She writes, I quote, "I'm not sure that would produce a criminal conviction because a jury listening to Mr. Eckstrom's testimony likely would conclude that he is too disconnected from reality to perjure himself."

Senator CAMPSEN: I'm not going to comment any further on that, Senator.

Senator GROOMS: That he was too disconnected from reality to perjure himself. That's probably an accurate statement. He looked straight at us and lied when asked a direct question, but he's clearly disconnected from reality.

Senator CAMPSEN: But proceeding under Section 3, Article 15 the standard for removal is willful neglect of duty. Do you think what you found through your hearings constitutes willful neglect of duty? It went on for multiple years, with knowledge, that has to be willful neglect of duty, does it not, Senator?

Senator GROOMS: Without a doubt. Willful neglect of duty.

Senator CAMPSEN: So therefore, it is more prudent for us to proceed under Section 3 of Article 15, which is not impeachment, but removal for willful neglect or reasonable cause.

Senator GROOMS: Or reasonable cause, correct.

Senator CAMPSEN: So that's a lower bar to clear than impeachment, and therefore, you have a better chance of that succeeding versus the impeachment route.

Senator GROOMS: Anyone who looks at the testimony, reads the report, and reads the footnotes would come to the same conclusion.

Senator CAMPSEN: Senator did you know I did a little research into this -- the history?

Senator GROOMS: As the author of the constitutional amendment, Senate 95 -- as the author of the constitutional amendment to remove the Comptroller General as an elected officer under Constitution -- that's you. You offered that amendment.

Senator CAMPSEN: I authored that amendment.

Senator GROOMS: Also I am recommending that we move forward with your constitutional amendment.

Senator GROOMS: That's good. It would be an appointed position not an elected position.

Senator GROOMS: Just an elected position.

Senator CAMPSEN: A bit of history, you know that I have a weakness, I want to look at the history of the constitutional provisions I looked at this because it drew my interest, because there is no provision like this in the Federal Constitution. It is only impeachment. Impeachment is the only way to remove a federal officer. But we have impeachment plus removal by vote of two-thirds of the House and two-thirds of the Senate for willful neglect of duty. And so, I did little research to determine why did we have this in our State Constitution? And some other states have it, but the Federal Constitution does not. And what I found is it was adopted in 1868, right after the Andrew Johnson impeachment effort.

And the states were looking at the Andrew Johnson impeachment proceedings that went on and on and on. And he was impeached for the violation of the Tenure in Office Act, which is an act that protected federal officers from being removed by the President. But his impeachment went from February 24th to May 26th. There was a trial that lasted longer than the trial that Senator HARPOOTLIAN was in down in Colleton County a couple of weeks ago, how long was that? Senator GROOMS: That was a long trial.

Senator CAMPSEN: That was a long trial, but this one went from February 24th to May 26th. And so, the states saw that -- they saw that process and concluded we need something impeachment like. We need some other way to remove officers for willful neglect of duty other than impeachment. And so these provisions were adopted in 1968. We had a constitutional convention. We talked about a convention of states on the federal constitution. We had many constitutional conventions and I'm looking at the proceedings of the South Carolina constitutional convention, January 11, 1968, the year this amendment was adopted. My last point I'm making but it's very -- I don't know if ironic is the term to use -- but certainly it indicates that this process that we're choosing is appropriate and relevant for the situation before us. And I'm quoting from that constitutional convention in 1968 -- and this is Mr. F. J. Moses, Jr., 1968 -- by referring to Section 4 of the article, which is Section 3 that we currently have in our Constitution, the non-impeachment process. By referring to Section 4, it will be seen that the Governor may for any willful neglect of duty remove any executive or judicial officer on the address of two-thirds of each House of the General Assembly -- on the address means upon the vote of two-thirds, and reasons given. The Governor must remove, doesn't have the choice, must remove. But this is what is really ironic. If we place a man in the Office of Treasurer or Comptroller General, incapable or unworthy of the confidence of the people, what is easier than to adopt the core suggested by the Constitution in that provision. Now, that's from 1968. That's not from yesterday. In 1968 the framers of that constitutional provision that we're implicating, that you recommend that we implicate and I agree with you, actually used the Comptroller General or the Treasurer as being the type of office that would be used to remove, because those offices -- one reason, is those offices were for four years then, and the Governor's office was only two. And so, the Governor, you could kind of withstand a bad governor for couple of years -- my time is up. You can withstand a bad governor for two years but not a bad Comptroller General or Treasurer for four years.

Senator GROOMS: Senator I did not know that.

PRESIDENT ALEXANDER: The time has expired. Senator from Sumter, for what purpose do you rise?

Senator McELVEEN: I would ask unanimous consent to give the Senator from Berkeley about five more minutes.

PRESIDENT ALEXANDER: Is there objection to five more minutes, Senator from Berkeley? Hearing none, so ordered. Senator from Sumter Senator McELVEEN: I ask if the Senator would yield for few questions. Senator GROOMS: Yes.

Senator McELVEEN: I would ask you to forgive me, first of all. I came in the Chamber toward the end of your introductory remarks. I had to meet with a group of high school students from my district, but I want to go back and touch on a few things. And the first thing I want to say, as a member of the subcommittee, I certainly take no pleasure in what we're doing right now.

Senator GROOMS: No.

Senator McELVEEN: I took no pleasure in what we had to do in the last few weeks, and I don't think, from my perspective, anybody on our subcommittee took pleasure in that.

Senator GROOMS: No, the members of the subcommittee were outstanding, every member of the subcommittee went into this with great care and great thought. Everyone participated and it was our unanimous conclusion with this report.

Senator McELVEEN: Did you know Senator one thing I'm glad about, I think this is the most recent thing to underscore the role we have as legislators on oversight. Right? Part of our duty is oversight. And that's the reason why you convened our finance subcommittee to hear from some of our agency folks every year in the first place. Right?

Senator GROOMS: That's correct. Just as the internal auditor pointed out annually of the material weakness, the deficiencies, within the Comptroller General's office, we're now pointing out the deficiencies to the General Assembly in that office. He didn't act. It is time for the General Assembly to act. Operating not knowing is one thing. We now know that there are issues in that office that will go unresolved until we correct the problem.

Senator McELVEEN: And Senator, while you're up there did you know I want to thank you number one for your leadership in dealing with this issue -- in a quick, efficient, and professional manner. That's the first thing. Thank you for your leadership. When the Senate got this, when we became aware of this, we acted quickly. Did you know I want to also thank the Chairman of Finance. You recall he came to us to our

subcommittee and told us very directly, get to the bottom of this. Do your job. Do the oversight. And I want to also thank him for giving us the staff to do that. And I heard Senator FANNING say it once, the staff just did an amazing job on this -- putting these meetings together, getting folks in to testify and working on our report. I would also second your plea to this Body to read that report from our subcommittee. It is thorough. It is well written. I want to thank all of our staff members for their hard work on this because it has been quick. It has been a lot of work, a lot of weekend work, so I just don't think most members will understand or appreciate how much they really had put into this over a short period of time.

Senator GROOMS: I appreciate that, those remarks, Senator. And there is one thing that I want to make sure the Body also knows that we were also tasked with to make sure it didn't happen again -- make sure the problem is corrected. We're reasonably sure the problem has been corrected, but we're not experts. And we have asked the state's internal auditor if he would review the correction that Ms. Kip has made within the office. We believe that she has now actually corrected the problem and it has to do with the way you reconcile accounts. She has reconciled the accounts, things that have happened before, things the internal auditor has recommended occur for years. She has now done those things. So to test the accuracy of the numbers within the system, they actually have to test, they actually have to perform some accounting tests within the system, to see if everything would then balance. And they estimate that that would take maybe up to a month. And so, we don't have assurances yet from the state's auditor that the problem has been corrected. We will report those findings once we receive them. But we're relatively sure the problem at this point has been corrected. But an issue is that the Comptroller's testimony is not reliable. It could not be counted on. If there are other problems that crop up, we have no assurances that they'll be dealt with. And we must have assurances with our budgeting numbers. When the Senate Finance Committee and the Ways and Means Committee receive information saying this much money is in this account, we base our decisions on that. We based our decision, yesterday, on what was it, \$1.2 billion? We based that decision on the fact that someone we trusted told us that it was \$1.2 billion in that account. We have to have reliance on our numbers. The people of the State need to have confidence in their government. The people of the State need to know that the finances of this State are in order and we have competent people that have professional credentials that can carry those out.

Senator McELVEEN: Senator, you know, I do have as a member of the committee several more questions I would like to ask you during this discussion but I see the chairman stood up, so I'd like to yield my time to him but may have few more questions after he gets finished. Go ahead. All right. So going back to just couple of things I want to make sure we talk about for a second here. Would you agree with me that this is my 11<sup>th</sup> year here? And the last time something like this came up before this Body, that I can recall, probably my first year here -- we had issues with the Department of Social Services. At some point in time this Body had drafted basically a Resolution, called for a vote of no confidence, which was laid on the desk and before we could even consider it there was a resignation and we kind of moved on. Do you recall that?

Senator GROOMS: Yes, I do.

Senator McELVEEN: That's the last time I can remember something of this magnitude since I've been here at least -- happening in, you know, a constitutional office or agency. That's the last thing I can remember that was even close to this. But going back to the issue at hand, Senator, one thing you touched on that caught my attention -- you talked about the staffing. You talked about the fact that every year, you know, this office and this Comptroller comes before your subcommittee and tells us the need, right?

Senator GROOMS: Yes.

Senator McELVEEN: And do you remember a few years ago, we had an issue, not the same but similar, with the Department of Motor Vehicles, where several stakeholders came to us and said a mistake was being made where we were not capturing commercial motor vehicle user fees like we should have to the tune of however many million dollars, I don't quite remember.

Senator GROOMS: Yes, it was over tens of millions annually.

Senator McELVEEN: So Senator, I'm sure you would agree with me, that nobody in this Body is for glut in government -- for having bloated bureaucracy -- we're not here for that. We don't look to do that. But back then, did you know, my comment was if the DMV would have come to us and said we have a new system, we just need FTE to deal with this one issue, to capture these revenues that should have been captured. That's money well spent, right?

Senator GROOMS: It is money well spent. When an agency director comes before a subcommittee and says I made a five and a half billion dollar blunder, but don't worry, I have all the staff I need. I don't need anybody else. And then we see in internal emails he really doesn't. We

hear from the testimony of others, he really doesn't. When we hear that shortcuts are being made, we've now been warned.

PRESIDENT ALEXANDER: Senator the additional five minutes has expired.

Senator McELVEEN: Unanimous consent request for five more minutes. PRESIDENT ALEXANDER: Is there objection to additional five minutes? Hearing no objection, so ordered.

Senator McELVEEN: So Senator, I mean, certainly wasting government over spending should concern all of us. But those times where under funding brings bigger picture issues and end up costing taxpayers money, that should be a legal concern, right? Especially in our oversight role. Is that correct?

Senator GROOMS: Particularly in the oversight role.

Senator McELVEEN: So Senator, you've covered most of the things already that really concern me about this, but here is one thing I want to go back to, I'm sorry -- I repeated this several times throughout the subcommittee and committee process. But do you recall me saying, you know, I'm not an accountant, I'm not a C.P.A. but, the question was asked several times during subcommittee, is when did you find out about this issue? And the response was: the issue or the amount? And response to that is you may recall, let's start with the issue itself. And I follow that up with, you know, if I'm an accountant and I'm sitting in my office, and somebody sits down in there and says there is a \$3.5 billion mistake. I'm pretty sure that's ten figures, I don't have to count that high usually, but that's a day I'm going to remember, like the day I got married, my birthdate, or the birth of my first child. Would you agree?

Senator GROOMS: I would absolutely agree. Accountants are particular people. The numbers have to balance, or it drives them nuts at night. And I like the example, that David Owens used, he said accountants are the people who can't stand for the check engine light to be on in their car. They see it every day and it bothers them. Everything needs to balance. But we've had a Comptroller General who signed his name on a comprehensive annual financial report knowing that there was something wrong with it. He didn't know exactly what was wrong with it, but we now know he believed there was something wrong with the reports that he was signing his name to as being accurate.

Senator McELVEEN: Do you share the same recollection as me? My comment to him was, if I find a mistake in my professional office, I'm going to start with the timeline, right. When did I find out about this? What was the damage? What did I do to correct it? And my recollection, Senator, is that the first day of testimony, the dates that we were given

were very different than the report that was given to us or the actual written timeline given to us the following week. Is that your recollection as well?

Senator GROOMS: There were multiple different timelines when things occurred. And the final timelines in this report came after his office was able to sit down, review document to document when meetings occurred, and then they were put in a chronological timeline. But you are absolutely right. It is like there is the problem. There is the long-standing riddle. It's been solved. Hallelujah, it's been around a while. We know there has been a problem. The long standing riddle has been solved. The \$4 billion question has been solved. Yes, I would absolutely remember that day.

Senator McELVEEN: Senator that's a different issue. Because, you know, with this particular situation, I felt like as a member of the subcommittee that we were approached with the kind of, mentality look what I fixed not look what I broke, right?

Senator GROOMS: By his testimony -- his own words -- I do not take responsibility for the problem even though statutory, constitutionally testimony from other agencies squarely tell us it was his problem and it occurred within his office. Let's forget that, I do not take responsibility for the problem -- I take responsibility for finding the solution. Give me another reward.

Senator McELVEEN: What I'm trying to get at here, Senator, is my recollection is when we got actually handed that written timeline the first thing that I saw on there was October of 2022. Is that correct?

Senator GROOMS: Yes.

Senator McELVEEN: When asked the previous week when this problem came to light, I was told, and the answer that I heard, and maybe I'm hard of hearing sometimes, maybe I have selective hearing sometimes, I heard early summer of last year when this problem came up. All right, and I asked a question on that. Does that mean May? I mean was early summer two weeks ago when it was seventy-five degrees here. I don't think it means October. And so, I'm just calling those inconsistencies to the attention of this Body because here is what concerns me. What if that was known before -- Senator CAMPSEN just talked about -- this is an elected official we're dealing with here. You have to be very careful about how we approach this. But I'm also talking about the voters here. Because if this was known, when filing closed in March of last year, is that fair to the voters? If this was known and not made public before a June primary last year, is that fair to the voters? We absolutely know by

everyone's account this was known before the general election. But it wasn't made clear to the public. Is that right?

Senator GROOMS: That's correct.

Senator McELVEEN: So, we talk about things like transparency in this Body, in this State House. Would you agree that's hardly transparent, would you not?

Senator GROOMS: That's not transparent. And the last thing to ask you about, because I think most of this has already been covered but you know, you recall this, because you were intimately involved, when we had the discussion and debate about stability with Santee Cooper a few years ago, right?

Senator GROOMS: Yes.

Senator McELVEEN: I heard this to no end during that debate and I wanted to know if you heard it also, the question was asked over and over again, could this affect our AAA Credit Rating? You remember that?

Senator GROOMS: Yes.

Senator McELVEEN: But did you also hear the same thing that I heard, you know the good news here as you've already alluded here, there is no money gone, right, just overstatement of our cash position. Same as if you had a business loan. They're going to come to you and ask what are your assets, what's your liability and what's your worth, right. And you and I both know what happens if you misrepresent that. Right?

Senator GROOMS: That's right, you could go to jail for that. If it was your C.P.A. that made an error this size, they would be gone by now. If this were a private business, if this were a publicly-traded company, if this were any other thing other than state government, the chief financial officer who compiled these statements would have been fired.

Senator McELVEEN: But you know, this, like we talked about earlier, you mentioned earlier, I believe and I hope that our state's economy and our cash are strong enough. We certainly don't want to affect our credit rating, but the threat is when you overstate your cash position by \$3.5 billion, correct?

Senator GROOMS: Absolutely correct.

Senator McELVEEN: What bothers me, did you know this and maybe you'll agree, just the cavalier attitude about this. It doesn't really matter because our State doesn't operate on credit. Our State balances our budget every year.

Senator GROOMS: That was one of the troubling aspects when he first appeared before us. How are you doing? Done a great job. There's a

little error, don't worry about it. Budget is fine. Don't need any help. Could you please repeat that little error thing again?

Senator McELVEEN: I heard error, I just didn't hear a lot about accountability within that office during the time that we spent taking testimony. I know others have questions, so I appreciate your leadership on this again Senator GROOMS. Thank you for answering my questions.

Senator GROOMS: I didn't mean to take up this much time with the members but this was a serious issue.

Senator PEELER: Senator Grooms, I appreciate your work, the work of you and your subcommittee -- did I hear you correctly, this is a unanimous report from the subcommittee?

Senator GROOMS: That's correct, three republicans, two democrats.

Senator PEELER: Thank you so very much. I appreciate your work --you and the subcommittee and the staff. I think the report is fair, thorough, and complete. I watched some of the testimony during y'all's meetings and you're right. It was embarrassing to say the least. If you were the Comptroller General, and you had performed this blunder, and you came before the subcommittee, I think the Comptroller General should do the right thing, if it were you, what would you do?

Senator GROOMS: The honorable thing to do would be to resign.

Senator PEELER: Has he indicated any thought of doing that?

Senator GROOMS: He hasn't been asked. Reporters have asked me that question of what I believe and I've asked to withhold any comment until we complete our report and published it. The report is now complete. It has been published. I'm asking the Comptroller General to resign. I believe that would be the honorable thing to do. I believe the votes are sufficient in the House and Senate to actually remove him from office. And I hope that he would help the General Assembly avoid us having to go through that. Thank you very much.

\*\*\*

#### ADDENDUM TO THE JOURNAL

The following remarks by Senator FANNING were ordered printed in the Journal of March 23, 2023:

# Remarks by Senator FANNING

There was a train; the train was loaded down, Senator SABB, with all kinds of things that they were taking to the next town. This train was a fairly new train but had been trying for years to start its work as a courier

of goods and services across the mountain to the next town that had been isolated for years.

The train is loaded down with stuff. It starts moving up the hill, chug, chug, chug, chug, chug. Eventually, about halfway up the hill, the train gave out. It got stuck halfway up the hill. You may remember this story. It was stuck. It couldn't go back down. If you'd release, you'd go back down to the town. It couldn't make it over the hill, so it was stuck there on the tracks. And the folks in the next town couldn't get the goods and services they'd been waiting on forever, and ever, and ever, and ever -real needs that they had. But the answers to their needs were sitting on this train that was stuck on the tracks. And they couldn't go down because they couldn't do anything about it; they didn't have the strength to go up the tracks.

So finally, Senator MATTHEWS, another train came by. This was a big locomotive -- it came up there booking it! Chug, chug, chug, chug, all the way up to the train, and they waived them down and said, "Stop! Save us! Save us!"

And so the train stopped and said, "What do you need?" And they said, "We need help getting over this hill. Will you help us get over the hill?" And it said, "I'm too busy. I can't do that. I have a lot of other things I need to do." So it went on by.

The train tried again -- couldn't do it again. Another train came by. This one was a passenger train. And said, "No, we've got other priorities. We can't really help you." They asked for help. Then finally, you'll remember this, a little blue engine came putting up the tracks. Little blue engine -- shiny, new little, tiny little train comes up next to him -- and the people waved him down saying, "Look, we're loading up with things we know children need. We're loading up with things that we know that the doctors have told us will help our kids in the community in the next town and help them with what they need, but we're stuck here on the tracks and nobody will help us. We've done the work to get over the hill, but nobody is going to help us." But the blue engine said, "I'll try. I've never been up the track myself at all before, but at least I'll try."

And so that little engine started -- it connected with the train -- and started going putter, putter, putter, putter, putter, putter. It started inching up over the hill. And the little blue engine started pulling it. And as he did, you know what the little engine was saying, do you not? "I think I can. I think I can. I think I can." Everybody on the train behind him is saying, "I think I can. I think I can." Because this has been going on forever and ever and ever, no one thought it could be done. But

there was one little blue engine that said you know what, I think I can do it.

And he worked his way up the hill pulling the train behind him -- "I think I can, I think I can." He crested over the top, and all of a sudden, the people in the town said, "Yay. We're finally going to get the help that our doctors have said we need! We're finally going to get the medicine we've been needing for years!" And as soon as he crested, the little blue engine went down the hill and said, "I knew I could. I knew I could. I knew I could."

I share that story with you to share that there have been children and elderly people waiting on an answer to their medical conditions. Kids with epilepsy, old folks that are suffering from all kinds of debilitating diseases that other states, with their trains, have been able to get the help to the citizens that need it, but not in South Carolina. We let it get stuck, and then all of a sudden, hauling from Beaufort, South Carolina, Senator TOM DAVIS was the little blue engine that could. He went up and took that thing that was stuck there forever. And for eight years -- putter, putter, putter, putter -- started hauling this over the top. And when I say hauling this over the top, when you have a problem with the Bill, he said, "How" can he change the Bill to get you onboard? If you don't think my analogy is working, if you don't like the Bill, what can we do to get you onboard?

He was willing to make changes to this Bill that, I'm guessing, Senator DAVIS, you didn't want to make; but you were willing to make the changes to get everyone onboard. And finally, in this story, we get over the hill. The little engine that could -- Senator DAVIS -- was able to get everyone onboard, and we passed this Bill with a vote of twenty-eight to sixteen. We took it down the mountain, and we got down the mountain, and the House said, "Go back." And now the Senate is going to make us spend another eight years with the little engine that could pulling it up.

Senator DAVIS, we thank you for the work that you've done for eight years on this Bill. From the bottom of my heart, thank you. But more importantly, we don't just owe Senator DAVIS the right to take up his Bill -- that we told him he was going to have -- we owe the citizens we represent to take up this Bill. The vote was not twenty-three to twenty-two -- the vote was twenty-eight to sixteen -- which proves that the little engine from Beaufort County took the Bill over the hill. We recognized that and we said, "Since the House screwed you on the other side of the hill, we'll give you a shot to do it again." This Bill is not what started the legislative session last year. This Bill, if I'm correct, Senator DAVIS, was what we finished with last year.

So for every one of you that didn't want to get onboard -- but Senator DAVIS changed his Bill to get you onboard -- that's the same Bill we're having now. It's the same Bill we sent over to the House. I don't know what y'all are doing. I am not asking you to pass the Bill at all. I respect your stance on the Bill. I'm asking you to debate the freaking Bill. Do the citizens of South Carolina not at least deserve the right to have us debate a Bill that meets their needs? A Bill that's already crossed over the hill. Why would we not debate a Bill that's exactly like the one we passed last year by an overwhelming twenty-eight to sixteen margin? And if anyone objects, couldn't we at least debate it and allow you to object again in the end. Don't our citizens deserve that.

Picture the citizens in the next town that have been waiting eight years! Children waiting for their medicine. Old folks waiting for their medicine. We have a Senator that has now made this Bill so conservative -- there's one way to get marijuana. If this passes, there would be two. One way is to drive to Five Points, roll down your window, and get marijuana. The other way is call your doctor, make an appointment, go see the doctor, have the doctor document that he tried everything else -- the only thing left after he tried everything else was to get medical cannabis. He still can't give it to you. You have to wait and go some place to get it and use it.

Now, which way do you think people are going to abuse it? Rolling down the window at Five Points or following this? He listened to you -- the little engine that could -- to try to get everybody onboard to get over the hill -- he listened to each and every one of us. We passed this twenty-eight to sixteen. And I'm not saying personally I feel like I owe you, Senator DAVIS, but I think more importantly, we owe the citizens we represent to at least have a debate on the Bill.

Is preemption any more or less important than this? Banning aliens from owning property? Is it any more or less important than this? Is passing one but not two voucher Bills when the Body has already spoken on this any more or less important?

When we make decisions, we are defining our relationship with the House, and so I hope we think about the decisions we have made this year of us getting our Bill over the hill to them. When we sent it over to them last year, they flipped their finger at us and sent us back on the other side of the mountain. Whether we act or don't act is sending a message. So if we don't send it back to them, we are saying, you are more powerful than we are. Is that the message that we want to send?

So if we're not tackling this eight-year issue, what's our plan? If we're not going to do this, let's say we persuade the little engine that could,

Senator DAVIS, to keep his name sponsoring the Bill. What's the plan? What do we tell him? Try again next year? Try again next year? If this is not the plan, what are we going to do to keep that engine from going over the hill -- what is it that we're going to do? We've got two ways to tackle this. We've already missed the boat on one. I hope we don't miss the other. Thank you, Mr. PRESIDENT.

\*\*\*

# INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

The following were introduced:

H. 3138 -- Rep. Bustos: A BILL TO AMEND THE SOUTH CAROLINA CODE OF LAWS BY ADDING CHAPTER 7 TO TITLE 55 SO AS TO PROVIDE FOR THE DISPOSAL OF ABANDONED OR DERELICT AIRCRAFT BY AN AIRPORT MANAGER. lc-0116cm23.docx: 55557a82-fe8f-4b31-8aac-bd2349c637f6 Read the first time and referred to the Committee on Transportation.

H. 3514 -- Reps. Ott, B. Newton, Murphy, Cobb-Hunter, Caskey, Kirby, Collins, Forrest, Bernstein, Wheeler, Taylor, Wetmore, J. Moore, Atkinson, Henegan, Blackwell, J. L. Johnson, Brewer, W. Newton, Herbkersman, Erickson, M. M. Smith and Leber: A BILL TO AMEND THE SOUTH CAROLINA CODE OF LAWS BY ADDING SECTION 52-5-300 BY ENACTING THE "SOUTH CAROLINA EQUINE ADVANCEMENT ACT" TO ESTABLISH A GRANT PROGRAM TO ASSIST THE GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE EQUINE INDUSTRY IN SOUTH CAROLINA; BY ADDING SECTION 52-5-310 SO AS TO PROVIDE DEFINITIONS; BY ADDING SECTION 52-5-320 SO AS TO ESTABLISH THE SOUTH CAROLINA EQUINE COMMISSION; BY ADDING SECTION 52-5-330 SO AS TO ESTABLISH THE POWERS OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA EQUINE COMMISSION; BY ADDING SECTION 52-5-340 SO AS TO PROVIDE ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT FOR THE SOUTH CAROLINA EQUINE COMMISSION; BY ADDING SECTION 52-5-350 SO AS TO PROVIDE GUIDELINES FOR PARI-MUTUEL WAGERING: BY ADDING SECTION 52-5-360 SO AS TO PROVIDE APPLICATION GUIDELINES FOR PARI-MUTUEL WAGERING; BY ADDING SECTION 52-5-370 SO AS TO PROVIDE FOR APPLICATION AND LICENSE FEES; BY ADDING SECTION 52-5-380 SO AS TO PROVIDE FOR THE EQUINE INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT FUND; BY ADDING SECTIONS 52-5-390 AND

52-5-400 SO AS TO PROVIDE GUIDELINES AND PROTECTIONS FOR COMMITTEE MEMBERS; AND BY ADDING SECTION 52-5-410 SO AS TO REQUIRE THE COMMISSION TO SUBMIT AN ANNUAL REPORT.

lc-0096ph23.docx: b1544fa8-fa90-4c12-8e2f-456dea1f7e15

Read the first time and referred to the Committee on Family and Veterans' Services.

H. 3558 -- Reps. G. M. Smith, Erickson, Crawford, Hewitt, Davis, T. Moore, B. Newton, Mitchell, Yow, Carter, Hixon, Hiott, Landing, W. Newton, Robbins, Brewer, Weeks, Wheeler, Taylor and Pope: A BILL TO AMEND THE SOUTH CAROLINA CODE OF LAWS BY ADDING SECTIONS 63-7-693 AND 63-7-696 SO AS TO REQUIRE PARTIES TO EXECUTE A SAFETY PLAN BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES MAY PLACE A CHILD OUTSIDE THE HOME WITHOUT TAKING LEGAL CUSTODY, TO ESTABLISH LIMITATIONS ON THE USE OF A SAFETY PLAN FOR CHILD PROTECTION, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES; BY **AMENDING SECTION** 63-7-650, **RELATING** TO PLACEMENT OF A CHILD OUTSIDE THE HOME INSTEAD OF ENTERING STATE CUSTODY, SO AS TO CHANGE CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO ASSESSING THE SAFETY AND APPROPRIATENESS OF AN OUT-OF-HOME PLACEMENT; BY **AMENDING** SECTION 63-7-690, RELATING TO ALLOWABLE TIMEFRAME TO MAKE AN INTERIM OUT-OF-HOME PLACEMENT OF A CHILD, SO AS TO CHANGE THE TIMEFRAME; AND BY AMENDING SECTION 63-7-730, RELATING TO EXPEDITED PLACEMENT OF CHILD WITH A RELATIVE AT THE PROBABLE CAUSE HEARING, SO AS TO MAKE CONFORMING CHANGES.

lc-0061vr23.docx: eb514b91-b006-4417-8893-439ccf4197f1

Read the first time and referred to the Committee on Family and Veterans' Services.

H. 3563 -- Reps. Cobb-Hunter, Pace, Collins, Bauer, Dillard, W. Jones, Wheeler, Hart, J. L. Johnson, Henegan, Williams, Trantham, Oremus, Cromer, Beach and Henderson-Myers: A BILL TO AMEND THE SOUTH CAROLINA CODE OF LAWS BY AMENDING SECTION 12-36-2120, RELATING TO SALES TAX EXEMPTIONS, SO AS TO PROVIDE FOR AN EXEMPTION FOR FEMININE HYGIENE PRODUCTS.

lc-0124sa23.docx: 710384ac-b738-4a69-a3bc-2cb93f515c0d Read the first time and referred to the Committee on Finance.

H. 3681 -- Reps. West, Long, Rutherford, Bannister, Bradley, Chumley, Hiott, Hixon, Atkinson and Kilmartin: A BILL TO AMEND THE SOUTH CAROLINA CODE OF LAWS BY ADDING SECTION 44-95-45 SO AS TO PROVIDE THAT POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS OF THIS STATE MAY NOT ENACT ANY LAWS, ORDINANCES, OR RULES PERTAINING TO INGREDIENTS, FLAVORS, OR LICENSING OF CIGARETTES, **ELECTRONIC SMOKING** DEVICES, E-LIQUID, **VAPOR** PRODUCTS, **TOBACCO** PRODUCTS, OR ALTERNATIVE NICOTINE PRODUCTS; AND TO PROVIDE THAT SUCH LAWS, ORDINANCES, AND RULES ENACTED BY A POLITICAL SUBDIVISION PRIOR DECEMBER 31, 2020, ARE NOT SUBJECT TO THE PREEMPTION IMPOSED BY THIS ACT.

lc-0123vr23.docx : 7e1c7c18-3bd7-4b4e-aa13-1783563dc5e8

Read the first time and referred to the Committee on Medical Affairs.

H. 3690 -- Reps. Taylor, G. M. Smith, Thayer, Bradley, Hiott, Bannister, W. Newton, Sandifer, West, Davis, Erickson, J. E. Johnson, Jordan, Whitmire, Hixon, Elliott, Forrest, Wooten, Bustos, Willis, Yow, Carter, Hartnett, Moss, McCravy, B. J. Cox, Haddon, Burns, Chumley, Oremus, Hardee, Ligon, Long, Gilliam, Magnuson, Lawson, Nutt, Brewer, Guffey, Hager, Mitchell, Neese, Sessions, Vaughan, Robbins, Kilmartin, M. M. Smith, B. Newton, Hewitt, Leber, Pope, Blackwell, Caskey and Landing: A BILL TO AMEND THE SOUTH CAROLINA CODE OF LAWS SO AS TO ENACT THE "ESG PENSION PROTECTION ACT"; BY AMENDING SECTION 9-16-10, RELATING TO RETIREMENT SYSTEM FUNDS DEFINITIONS SO AS TO ADD A DEFINITION OF "PECUNIARY FACTOR"; BY AMENDING SECTION 9-16-30, RELATING TO DELEGATION OF FUNCTIONS BY THE COMMISSION, SO AS TO PROVIDE THAT PROXY VOTING DECISIONS MUST BE BASED ON PECUNIARY FACTORS; BY AMENDING SECTION 9-16-50, RELATING TO INVESTMENT AND MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS BY TRUSTEES, SO AS TO PROVIDE THAT THE COMMISSION MAY ONLY CONSIDER PECUNIARY FACTORS IN MAKING CERTAIN INVESTMENT DECISIONS; BY AMENDING SECTION 9-16-320, RELATING TO ANNUAL INVESTMENT PLANS SO AS TO REQUIRE CERTAIN MEETINGS; BY AMENDING SECTION 9-16-

330, RELATING TO STATEMENT OF ACTUARIAL ASSUMPTIONS AND INVESTMENT OBJECTIVES, SO AS TO REQUIRE CERTAIN CERTIFICATIONS; AND BY ADDING SECTION 9-16-110 SO AS TO PROVIDE THAT THE ATTORNEY GENERAL MAY BRING AN ACTION TO ENFORCE CERTAIN PROVISIONS.

lc-0146sa23.docx : 9779928b-c3e7-42f4-916c-8b6a87b39865 Read the first time and referred to the Committee on Finance.

H. 3691 -- Reps. G. M. Smith, M. M. Smith, Davis, B. L. Cox, Pace, Guest, Leber, J. E. Johnson, Pope, Brittain, McGinnis, Hardee, Hewitt, Jordan, Thayer, Anderson, Rutherford, Trantham, Bailey, Schuessler, Gagnon, Beach, Oremus, Forrest, S. Jones, Taylor, Hixon, Blackwell, Collins, Bannister, Hiott, Carter, O'Neal, Ligon, Guffey, Sessions, T. Moore, Nutt, Hayes, Yow, Mitchell, Connell, Hager, B. Newton, White, Landing, Kirby, Moss, Bustos, Long, Caskey, Cromer and Weeks: A BILL TO AMEND THE SOUTH CAROLINA CODE OF LAWS BY ADDING SECTION 17-5-135 SO AS TO ALLOW CORONERS TO POSSESS AND ADMINISTER OPIOID ANTIDOTES UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES; BY ADDING SECTION 44-130-90 SO AS TO PROVIDE PROCEDURES FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF OPIOID ANTIDOTES BY CORONERS AND THE REPORTING OF THEIR USE; AND BY AMENDING SECTION 17-5-510, RELATING TO DUTIES OF CORONERS AND MEDICAL EXAMINERS, SO AS TO PROVIDE THAT CORONERS ARE CONSIDERED PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS IF KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY.

lc-0109ahb23.docx : ce0b8b9f-a9dc-48a8-9eb0-b194048ff389 Read the first time and referred to the Committee on Judiciary.

H. 3737 -- Reps. Ligon, Haddon, B. Newton, Neese, O'Neal, Pope, Felder, Guffey, West, Hyde, Henegan, Williams, Atkinson, Herbkersman, Weeks, Wheeler, Gagnon and Taylor: A BILL TO AMEND THE SOUTH CAROLINA CODE OF LAWS BY ENACTING THE "SHORT LINE RAILROAD MODERNIZATION ACT"; AND BY ADDING SECTION 12-6-3810 SO AS TO PROVIDE FOR AN INCOME TAX CREDIT EQUAL TO FIFTY PERCENT OF AN ELIGIBLE TAXPAYER'S QUALIFIED RAILROAD RECONSTRUCTION OR REPLACEMENT EXPENDITURES, AND TO PROVIDE FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE TAX CREDIT.

lc-0102dg23.docx : 3bf31e34-75a2-48ea-af31-7c0d7198cf21 Read the first time and referred to the Committee on Finance.

H. 3786 -- Reps. Lowe, G. M. Smith, Bannister, Jordan, Rutherford, Bernstein, Cobb-Hunter, Henegan, Gilliam, Hewitt, Erickson, Ott, M. M. Smith, W. Newton, Murphy, Gatch, Elliott, Herbkersman, Hosey, McDaniel, Mitchell, Stavrinakis, Taylor, Wooten, Carter, Atkinson, Kirby, Hyde, Leber, Alexander, B. Newton, Ballentine, Pope, Hixon, Brittain, Gagnon, Ligon, Wetmore, Davis, Brewer, Robbins, Bauer, Weeks, Dillard and W. Jones: A BILL TO AMEND THE SOUTH CAROLINA CODE OF LAWS BY ENACTING THE "SOUTH CAROLINA CONSERVATION ENHANCEMENT ACT"; BY AMENDING SECTION 12-24-90. RELATING TO THE DEED RECORDING FEE, SO AS TO REQUIRE A PORTION OF THE FEE TO BE CREDITED TO THE SOUTH CAROLINA CONSERVATION BANK TRUST FUND; AND BY AMENDING SECTION 48-59-40, RELATING TO THE BOARD OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA CONSERVATION BANK, SO AS TO ADD ADDITIONAL MEMBERS TO THE BOARD.

lc-0115dg23.docx : 672376c5-3aae-4c6b-a6fd-6bdcc83858b1 Read the first time and referred to the Committee on Finance.

H. 3810 -- Rep. Elliott: A BILL TO AMEND THE SOUTH CAROLINA CODE OF LAWS BY AMENDING SECTION 12-20-50, RELATING TO THE IMPOSITION OF LICENSE TAXES ON CORPORATIONS, SO AS TO PROVIDE THAT THE FEE DOES NOT APPLY TO ANY PORTION OF THE FIRST FIFTY MILLION DOLLARS OF CERTAIN CAPITAL STOCK AND PAID-IN OR CAPITAL SURPLUS.

lc-0191sa23.docx : 2cbcb0dc-3dcf-4587-aecb-ad18968d2bb1 Read the first time and referred to the Committee on Finance.

H. 3865 -- Reps. Hiott, Collins, Rutherford, Carter and Robbins: A BILL TO AMEND THE SOUTH CAROLINA CODE OF LAWS BY AMENDING SECTION 17-5-130, RELATING TO CORONER QUALIFICATIONS, SO AS TO INCLUDE LICENSED PARAMEDICS WITH AT LEAST THREE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AS ONE OF THE ADDITIONAL QUALIFICATIONS A CORONER MUST HAVE.

lc-0133hdb23.docx : fdab0d61-ad3a-4282-bfcf-14e85e0cf09b Read the first time and referred to the Committee on Judiciary.

H. 3870 -- Reps. Wooten, Erickson, Caskey, Ballentine, West, Hewitt, Wetmore, Dillard, M. M. Smith and Davis: A BILL TO AMEND THE SOUTH CAROLINA CODE OF LAWS BY ADDING SECTION 40-43-72 SO AS TO AUTHORIZE THE PERMITTING AND OPERATION OF NARCOTIC TREATMENT PROGRAMS, TO ESTABLISH CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS FOR NARCOTIC **TREATMENT PROGRAMS AND** THEIR ASSOCIATED PHARMACISTS, PRACTITIONERS, **AND PRACTITIONER** AGENTS, TO REQUIRE THE BOARD OF PHARMACY TO **FULFILL** CERTAIN OBLIGATIONS, AND FOR **OTHER** PURPOSES; AND BY**AMENDING** SECTION 44-53-720, RELATING TO RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF METHADONE, SO AS TO MAKE CONFORMING CHANGES.

lc-0164vr23.docx : 629b0aec-ae46-4e1b-894f-31ccee856c70

Read the first time and referred to the Committee on Medical Affairs.

H. 3877 -- Reps. West, J. Moore, M. M. Smith, Atkinson, B. J. Cox, Gagnon, Hayes, Caskey and Chapman: A BILL TO AMEND THE SOUTH CAROLINA CODE OF LAWS BY AMENDING SECTION 40-47-1250, **RELATING** TO **SUPERVISION** ANESTHESIOLOGISTS' ASSISTANTS, SO AS TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF ANESTHESIOLOGISTS' ASSISTANTS THAT AN ANESTHESIOLOGIST MAY SUPERVISE; AND BY AMENDING **SECTION** 40-47-1240, **RELATING** TO **LICENSURE** ANESTHESIOLOGIST'S ASSISTANTS, SO AS TO REMOVE THE LICENSURE APPLICANTS REQUIREMENT THAT APPEAR BEFORE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF MEDICAL **EXAMINERS AND PRESENT** EVIDENCE OF RELEVANT ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS AND KNOWLEDGE. lc-0158wab23.docx: 964bc96c-97cb-483b-aa06-e408151e8d39

Read the first time and referred to the Committee on Medical Affairs.

H. 3908 -- Reps. Collins, G. M. Smith, Bannister, Erickson, Whitmire, Felder, Bernstein, Ott, Haddon, W. Newton, Carter, Elliott, Crawford, Ballentine, Caskey, Wetmore, Stavrinakis, Mitchell, Yow, M. M. Smith, Willis, Vaughan, Cobb-Hunter, Oremus, McGinnis, Trantham, Calhoon, Gatch, Weeks, Rose, Alexander, Tedder, Garvin, Murphy, Sandifer, Hartnett, Robbins, Brewer, Pope, Pace, Henegan, Williams, Wheeler, Wooten, T. Moore, Hyde and Lawson: A BILL TO AMEND THE SOUTH CAROLINA CODE OF LAWS BY ADDING SECTION 8-11-151 SO AS TO DEFINE TERMS AND TO PROVIDE PAID

PARENTAL LEAVE UPON THE BIRTH OF A CHILD OR INITIAL LEGAL PLACEMENT OF A FOSTER CHILD FOR ELIGIBLE SCHOOL DISTRICT EMPLOYEES; AND BY ADDING SECTION 8-11-156 SO AS TO DEFINE TERMS AND TO PROVIDE PAID PARENTAL LEAVE UPON THE INITIAL LEGAL PLACEMENT OF A CHILD BY ADOPTION FOR ELIGIBLE SCHOOL DISTRICT EMPLOYEES.

lc-0171ph23.docx : 93a71b1f-d18d-40f4-bb9b-095898d62092 Read the first time and referred to the Committee on Finance.

H. 4017 -- Rep. Ballentine: A BILL TO AMEND THE SOUTH CAROLINA CODE OF LAWS BY AMENDING SECTION 12-6-40, RELATING TO APPLICATION OF FEDERAL INTERNAL REVENUE CODE TO STATE TAX LAWS, SO AS TO UPDATE THE REFERENCE TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE TO THE YEAR 2022 AND TO PROVIDE THAT IF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE SECTIONS ADOPTED BY THIS STATE ARE EXTENDED, THEN THESE SECTIONS ALSO ARE EXTENDED FOR SOUTH CAROLINA INCOME TAX PURPOSES.

lc-0164dg23.docx : f1dd0b2e-91cd-445e-8e98-666881053001 Read the first time and referred to the Committee on Finance.

H. 4020 -- Reps. W. Newton, Erickson, Herbkersman, Stavrinakis, Bradley, Elliott, Murphy, Wetmore, B. Newton, Bannister, G. M. Smith, Weeks, Dillard, W. Jones, Taylor and M. M. Smith: A BILL TO AMEND THE SOUTH CAROLINA CODE OF LAWS BY AMENDING SECTION 12-62-50, RELATING TO THE TAX REBATE FOR CERTAIN MOTION PICTURE PRODUCTION COMPANIES, SO AS TO INCREASE THE ANNUAL LIMIT, AND BY ALLOWING THE USE OF REBATES FOR CERTAIN EXPENDITURES AND EXPENSES; AND BY REPEALING 12-62-60 **RELATING** TO **DISTRIBUTION SECTION** ADMISSIONS TAXES FOR REBATES TO MOTION PICTURE PRODUCTION COMPANIES AND CERTAIN DEPARTMENTAL EXPENSES.

lc-0140dg23.docx : b0c9fc3a-7d06-454a-9200-f7f0b9a74f3b Read the first time and referred to the Committee on Finance.

H. 4040 -- Reps. Gilliard and Stavrinakis: A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO REQUEST THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION NAME THE PORTION OF GARDEN STREET

FROM ITS INTERSECTION WITH HOFF AVENUE TO ITS INTERSECTION WITH HUNTLEY DRIVE IN THE CITY OF CHARLESTON IN CHARLESTON COUNTY "BILL SHARPE WAY" AND ERECT APPROPRIATE SIGNS OR MARKERS AT THIS LOCATION CONTAINING THESE WORDS.

lc-0245cm-gt23.docx : 767e646b-d0f9-48bf-9a9a-53a5ca33b875

The Concurrent Resolution was introduced and referred to the Committee on Transportation.

H. 4087 -- Reps. G. M. Smith, West, Kirby, Ballentine, Robbins, Hewitt, M. M. Smith, Davis, Hiott, Long, Hager, Ott, Weeks, Dillard, W. Jones, Brewer, Hartnett and Murphy: A BILL TO AMEND THE SOUTH CAROLINA CODE OF LAWS BY AMENDING SECTION 12-6-3410, RELATING TO CORPORATE INCOME TAX CREDIT FOR CORPORATE HEADQUARTERS, SO AS TO PROVIDE CHANGES TO STAFFING REQUIREMENTS AND CERTAIN TIMING; BY AMENDING SECTION 12-6-3460, RELATING TO THE RECYCLING FACILITY TAX CREDIT DEFINITIONS, SO AS TO LOWER THE MINIMUM LEVEL OF INVESTMENT FOR A OUALIFIED RECYCLING FACILITY AND TO INCLUDE **CERTAIN PRODUCTS** TO THE **DEFINITION** "POSTCONSUMER WASTE MATERIAL"; BY AMENDING SECTIONS 12-10-20; 12-10-30, 12-10-40, 12-10-45, 12-10-50, 12-10-60, AND 12-10-80, ALL RELATING TO THE ENTERPRISE ZONE ACT OF 1995, SO AS TO ALLOW REMOTE EMPLOYEES WORKING IN SOUTH CAROLINA TO BE INCLUDED IN CERTAIN JOB CREATION REQUIREMENTS AND TO CREATE A NEW PROVISION TO INCENTIVIZE CERTAIN COMPANIES; AND BY AMENDING SECTION 12-10-95, RELATING TO THE ENTERPRISE ZONE ACT CREDIT AGAINST WITHHOLDING FOR RETRAINING, SO AS TO PROVIDE WHO IS ELIGIBLE FOR THE CREDIT AND THE AMOUNT OF THE CREDIT ALLOWED. lc-0140sa23.docx : 0774ef62-a7b7-4d07-a468-4b683e5373fa

Read the first time and referred to the Committee on Finance.

H. 4096 -- Rep. Hardee: A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO REQUEST THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION NAME THE INTERSECTION OF S-26-31/RED BLUFF ROAD AND S-26-66 IN HORRY COUNTY THE "CHRISTOPHER AND MILES WADDELL MEMORIAL INTERSECTION" AND PLACE

APPROPRIATE MARKERS OR SIGNS AT THIS LOCATION CONTAINING THESE WORDS.

lc-0251cm-gt23.docx: 6bda7efa-c795-4bbd-b30c-370a12990cf5

The Concurrent Resolution was introduced and referred to the Committee on Transportation.

H. 4115 -- Reps. Sandifer, Ott and Brewer: A BILL TO AMEND THE SOUTH CAROLINA CODE OF LAWS BY AMENDING SECTION 40-11-10, RELATING TO THE CREATION OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA CONTRACTOR'S LICENSING BOARD, SO AS TO MAKE A TECHNICAL CORRECTION; BY AMENDING SECTION 40-11-20, RELATING TO DEFINITIONS CONCERNING THE REGULATION OF CONTRACTORS. SO AS TO REVISE DEFINITIONS AND PROVIDE NEW DEFINITIONS: AMENDING SECTION 40-11-30, RELATING TO CONTRACTING WORK FOR WHICH LICENSURE IS REQUIRED, SO AS TO INCREASE THE MINIMUM COST OF SUCH WORK TO TEN THOUSAND DOLLARS; BY AMENDING SECTION 40-11-100, **RELATING** TO **ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTIES** VIOLATIONS, SO AS TO REVISE THE PENALTIES; BY AMENDING SECTION 40-11-110, RELATING TO DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS, SO AS TO REVISE THE GROUNDS FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS, AMONG OTHER THINGS; BY AMENDING SECTION 40-11-230, RELATING TO QUALIFYING PARTY CERTIFICATION FOR INDIVIDUALS, SO AS TO REVISE CERTIFICATION CRITERIA AND REQUIREMENTS SERVICE; BY AMENDING SECTION 40-11-240, RELATING TO **OUALIFYING PARTY CERTIFICATION FOR ENTITIES, SO AS TO** REVISE CERTIFICATION CRITERIA AND REQUIREMENTS FOR SERVICE; BY AMENDING SECTION 40-11-250, RELATING TO RENEWALS OF LAPSED LICENSES, SO AS TO PROVIDE RENEWALS COMPLETED WITHIN NINETY DAYS AFTER LICENSURE EXPIRATION ARE CONSIDERED RENEWED RETROACTIVELY TO THE EXPIRATION DATE AND PERIODS OF LICENSURE LAPSE ARE ELIMINATED; BY AMENDING SECTION 40-11-260, RELATING TO LICENSEE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS, SO AS TO REVISE SUCH REQUIREMENTS FOR ALL LICENSE GROUPS, **PROVIDE INFORMATION** AND TO IN **FINANCIAL** STATEMENTS MAY NOT BE FURTHER DISCLOSED; BY AMENDING SECTION 40-11-262, RELATING TO SURETY

BONDS IN LIEU OF PROVIDING FINANCIAL STATEMENTS, SO AS TO MAKE CONFORMING CHANGES AND TO PROVIDE THE BOARD MAY INCREASE BOND REQUIREMENTS IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES; BY AMENDING SECTION 40-11-290, RELATING TO LICENSURE OF APPLICANTS LICENSED IN OTHER STATES, SO AS TO SPECIFY THE EXAMINATION SUCH APPLICANTS MAY BE REQUIRED TO PASS; BY AMENDING 40-11-320, RELATING TO CONSTRUCTION MANAGERS, SO AS TO REVISE REQUIRED REGISTRATION PROCEDURES; BY AMENDING SECTION 40-11-360, RELATING TO EXEMPTIONS FROM APPLICATION OF THE CHAPTER AND REQUIRED CONTENT OF POSTERS DISTRIBUTED BUILDING PERMIT OFFICES. SO AS TO REVISE THE EXEMPTIONS AND ELIMINATE THE POSTER REQUIREMENT: BY AMENDING SECTION 40-11-410, RELATING TO LICENSE CLASSIFICATIONS AND SUBCLASSIFICATIONS, SO AS TO REVISE THE CLASSIFICATIONS; BY REPEALING SECTION 40-11-390 RELATING TO UNLICENSED ENTITIES ENGAGING IN GENERAL OR MECHANICAL CONSTRUCTION PRIOR TO APRIL 1, 1999; AND BY REPEALING SECTION 40-11-400 RELATING TO QUALIFYING PARTY CERTIFICATES.

lc-0248wab23.docx: 45eed403-a658-4120-ab61-8fba4e1234ae

Read the first time and referred to the Committee on Labor, Commerce and Industry.

H. 4116 -- Reps. Sandifer, M. M. Smith and King: A BILL TO AMEND THE SOUTH CAROLINA CODE OF LAWS BY ADDING SECTION 40-19-295 SO AS TO PROHIBIT THE DIVIDING OF FEES OR OTHER COMPENSATION CHARGED OR RECEIVED BY LICENSEES OF THE BOARD OF FUNERAL SERVICES WITH **ANOTHER** PERSON, PARTNERSHIP, CORPORATION, ASSOCIATION, OR LEGAL ENTITY FOR THE DELIVERY OR PERFORMANCE OF FUNERAL SERVICES: BY AMENDING 32-7-100. PENALTIES SECTION RELATING TO VIOLATIONS OF PROVISIONS REGULATING PRENEED FUNERAL CONTRACTS, SO AS TO INCREASE FINE RANGES AND PERMANENTLY BAR PERSONS CONVICTED OF A FELONY FROM CONDUCTING PRENEED CONTRACT SALES; BY AMENDING SECTION 32-7-110, RELATING TO THE INVESTIGATION OF COMPLAINTS AGAINST UNLICENSED PRENEED CONTRACT SALES PROVIDERS, SO AS TO PROVIDE

COMPLAINTS TO WHICH THE DEPARTMENT SHALL RESPOND MAY BE WRITTEN OR ORAL; BY AMENDING SECTION 32-8-360, RELATING TO PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE SAFE CREMATION ACT, SO AS TO INCREASE MONETARY FINES AND REQUIRE IMMEDIATE REPORTING OF VIOLATIONS TO THE BOARD: BY AMENDING SECTION 32-8-385, RELATING TO REQUIREMENTS THAT CREMATORIES EMPLOY CERTAIN TRAINED STAFF TO PERFORM CREMATIONS, SO AS TO REQUIRE ALL CREMATIONS BE PERFORMED BY THESE TRAINED STAFF MEMBERS; BY AMENDING SECTION 40-19-20, RELATING TO DEFINITIONS CONCERNING THE REGULATION OF EMBALMERS AND FUNERAL DIRECTORS, SO AS TO REVISE CERTAIN DEFINITIONS: BY AMENDING SECTION 40-19-30. RELATING TO THE REOUIREMENT OF LICENSURE TO PRACTICE FUNERAL SERVICES, SO AS TO PROVIDE CONDUCT CONSTITUTING THE PRACTICE OF FUNERAL SERVICES INCLUDES PARTIES WHO EXERCISE ANY CONTROL OR AUTHORITY OVER A FUNERAL ESTABLISHMENT OR ITS EMPLOYEES, AGENTS, OR REPRESENTATIVES, AND TO PROHIBIT CORPORATIONS, PARTNERSHIPS, OR INDIVIDUALS IN WHOSE NAME APPEARS THE NAME OF A PERSON WITH A REVOKED OR LAPSED LICENSE FROM HAVING A LICENSE TO OPERATE A FUNERAL HOME; BY AMENDING SECTION 40-19-70, RELATING TO POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE BOARD, SO AS TO PROVIDE BOARD MEMBERS, COMMITTEES, OR EMPLOYEES MAY NOT BE LIABLE FOR ACTS PERFORMED IN THE COURSE OF THEIR OFFICIAL DUTIES IN THE ABSENCE OF MALICE SHOWN AND PROVEN IN A COURT OF COMPETENT JURISDICTION; BY AMENDING SECTION 40-19-80, RELATING TO INSPECTORS EMPLOYED BY THE BOARD, SO AS TO INSTEAD REQUIRE THE BOARD TO EMPLOY AT LEAST TWO INVESTIGATORS WHO MAY BE LICENSED EMBALMERS AND FUNERAL DIRECTORS WITH CERTAIN EXPERIENCE BUT WHO HAVE NOT BEEN DISCIPLINED; BY AMENDING SECTION 40-19-110, **RELATING** CONDUCT TO **CONSTITUTING** UNPROFESSIONAL CONDUCT BY A LICENSEE OF THE BOARD. SO AS TO MAKE GRAMMATICAL CHANGES; BY AMENDING SECTION 40-19-115, RELATING TO JURISDICTION OF THE BOARD, SO AS TO INCLUDE UNLICENSED PERSONS WITH THIS JURISDICTION; BY AMENDING SECTION 40-19-200, RELATING TO PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS OF PROVISIONS

PROHIBITING THE PRACTICE OF FUNERAL SERVICES WITHOUT A LICENSE OR USING FALSE INFORMATION TO OBTAIN SUCH LICENSURE, SO AS TO INCREASE MONETARY FINES, AND TO SUBJECT PERSONS WHO AID AND ABET UNLICENSED PERSONS OR ENTITIES IN ENGAGING IN THE PRACTICE OF FUNERAL SERVICE WITHOUT LICENSURE TO THESE PENALTIES; BY AMENDING SECTION 40-19-250, RELATING TO CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS, SO AS TO REQUIRE CERTAIN COURSEWORK IN ETHICS, TO REQUIRE FOUR HOURS OF TOTAL ANNUAL COURSEWORK, TO REQUIRE A CERTAIN PORTION OF THIS COURSEWORK TO BE IN ETHICS, AND TO REQUIRE A CERTAIN PORTION OF THIS COURSEWORK BE COMPLETED IN PERSON: AND BY SECTION 40-19-290, RELATING TO **AMENDING FIDUCIARY** RESPONSIBILITIES OF **FUNERAL** ESTABLISHMENTS WITH RESPECT TO PAYMENTS RECEIVED FOR FUNERAL MERCHANDISE BEING PURCHASED, SO AS TO PROVIDE THESE PAYMENTS MUST BE KEPT IN A TRUST ACCOUNT UNTIL THE MERCHANDISE IS DELIVERED FOR ITS INTENDED USE OR IS DELIVERED INTO THE PHYSICAL POSSESSION OF THE PURCHASER.

lc-0247wab23.docx: 85522d23-4ff8-44ee-93b8-c9caf63493cf Read the first time and referred to the Committee on Judiciary.

H. 4118 -- Reps. Weeks, Gagnon, Alexander, Dillard, W. Jones, Gatch, Henegan and Williams: A BILL TO AMEND THE SOUTH CAROLINA CODE OF LAWS BY AMENDING SECTION 12-6-3530, RELATING TO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TAX CREDITS, SO AS TO EXTEND THE CREDIT AND TO PROVIDE FOR AN INCREASE IN THE CREDIT AMOUNT; AND TO EXTEND THE PROVISIONS OF ACT 314 OF 2000.

lc-0262sa23.docx : fc9af30a-97fd-4a54-b8c1-360860dea996
Read the first time and referred to the Committee on Finance.

H. 4124 -- Reps. G. M. Smith, Bannister, Herbkersman, Yow, Mitchell, Murphy, Brewer, Robbins, Gatch, M. M. Smith and Davis: A BILL TO AMEND THE SOUTH CAROLINA CODE OF LAWS BY AMENDING SECTION 44-1-20, RELATING TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL, SO AS TO PROVIDE FOR THE CREATION OF A DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH TO ASSUME THE HEALTH-RELATED

FUNCTIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES; BY AMENDING SECTIONS 44-1-60, 44-1-140, AND 44-1-150, ALL RELATING TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL, SO AS TO MAKE CONFORMING CHANGES: BY REPEALING SECTIONS 1-30-45 AND 44-1-65 RELATING TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL AND THE PERMITTING OF CERTAIN ANIMAL FACILITIES; BY RENAMING CHAPTER 1 OF TITLE 44, "DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH"; BY ADDING CHAPTER 6 TO TITLE 48 SO AS TO CREATE THE DEPARTMENT OF **ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES** TO **ASSUME** THE **ENVIRONMENTAL-RELATED FUNCTIONS** OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL. TO PROVIDE FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF A DIRECTOR BY THE GOVERNOR, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES; BY AMENDING SECTION 1-30-10, RELATING TO DEPARTMENTS OF STATE GOVERNMENT, SO AS TO ADD THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES; AND BY ADDING SECTIONS 1-30-135 AND 1-30-140 SO AS TO MAKE CONFORMING CHANGES.

lc-0204vr23.docx: f8e65c6a-cb23-4694-9be5-6aefc9774108

Read the first time and referred to the Committee on Medical Affairs.

H. 4207 -- Rep. Gagnon: A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO REQUEST THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION NAME THE INTERSECTION LOCATED AT THE JUNCTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA HIGHWAY 187 AND SOUTH CAROLINA HIGHWAY 29 IN ANDERSON COUNTY "PAUL ROBINSON EARLE MEMORIAL INTERSECTION" AND ERECT APPROPRIATE MARKERS OR SIGNS AT THIS INTERSECTION CONTAINING THIS DESIGNATION.

lc-0278cm-gt23.docx: e7695afc-8abe-421a-8d14-8cfd44eb5611

The Concurrent Resolution was introduced and referred to the Committee on Transportation.

H. 4279 -- Reps. Howard, Alexander, Anderson, Atkinson, Bailey, Ballentine, Bamberg, Bannister, Bauer, Beach, Bernstein, Blackwell, Bradley, Brewer, Brittain, Burns, Bustos, Calhoon, Carter, Caskey, Chapman, Chumley, Clyburn, Cobb-Hunter, Collins, Connell, B. J. Cox, B. L. Cox, Crawford, Cromer, Davis, Dillard, Elliott, Erickson, Felder,

Forrest, Gagnon, Garvin, Gatch, Gibson, Gilliam, Gilliard, Guest, Guffey, Haddon, Hager, Hardee, Harris, Hart, Hartnett, Hayes, Henderson-Myers, Henegan, Herbkersman, Hewitt, Hiott, Hixon, Hosey, Hyde, Jefferson, J. E. Johnson, J. L. Johnson, S. Jones, W. Jones, Jordan, Kilmartin, King, Kirby, Landing, Lawson, Leber, Ligon, Long, Lowe, Magnuson, May, McCabe, McCravy, McDaniel, McGinnis, Mitchell, J. Moore, T. Moore, A. M. Morgan, T. A. Morgan, Moss, Murphy, Neese, B. Newton, W. Newton, Nutt, O'Neal, Oremus, Ott, Pace, Pedalino, Pendarvis, Pope, Rivers, Robbins, Rose, Rutherford, Sandifer, Schuessler, Sessions, G. M. Smith, M. M. Smith, Stavrinakis, Taylor, Tedder, Thayer, Thigpen, Trantham, Vaughan, Weeks, West, Wetmore, Wheeler, White, Whitmire, Williams, Willis, Wooten and Yow: A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO RECOGNIZE AND COMMEND THE OUTSTANDING CHARITABLE WORK OF THE BEAUTY GRAND CHAPTER OF THE ORDER OF THE EASTERN STAR, AND TO CONGRATULATE ITS MEMBERS UPON REACHING THE **MILESTONE** OF **THEIR** SIXTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF SERVICE IN SOUTH CAROLINA.

lc-0237vr-cc23.docx : 495df2b0-845b-4792-bc3c-ed824b42675b

The Concurrent Resolution was adopted, ordered returned to the House.

# Message from the House

Columbia, S.C., April 6, 2023

Mr. President and Senators:

The House respectfully informs your Honorable Body that it has returned the following Resolution to the Senate with amendments:

S. 604 -- Senators Peeler, Alexander, Setzler, Malloy and Scott: A JOINT RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE EXPENDITURE OF FEDERAL FUNDS DISBURSED TO THE STATE IN THE AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT OF 2021, AND TO SPECIFY THE MANNER IN WHICH THE FUNDS MAY BE EXPENDED.

Very respectfully,

Speaker of the House

Received as information.

Placed on Calendar for consideration tomorrow.

### **HOUSE CONCURRENCES**

S. 230 -- Senator Talley: A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO REQUEST THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION NAME

THE BRIDGE THAT CROSSES THE MIDDLE TYGER RIVER ALONG MAIN STREET IN THE TOWN OF STARTEX IN SPARTANBURG COUNTY "FITZHUGH DAVID POWERS MEMORIAL BRIDGE" AND ERECT APPROPRIATE MARKERS OR SIGNS AT THIS LOCATION CONTAINING THESE WORDS.

Returned with concurrence.

Received as information.

S. 491 -- Senator Fanning: A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO REQUEST THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION NAME THE PORTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA HIGHWAY 34 IN FAIRFIELD COUNTY FROM THE NEWBERRY/FAIRFIELD COUNTY LINE TO STATE ROAD S-20-99 "JOHNNY PEOPLES MEMORIAL HIGHWAY" AND ERECT APPROPRIATE MARKERS OR SIGNS ALONG THIS PORTION OF HIGHWAY CONTAINING THESE WORDS.

Returned with concurrence.

Received as information.

S. 589 -- Senators Stephens and Hutto: A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO REQUEST THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION NAME THE PORTION OF HOMESTEAD ROAD IN ORANGEBURG COUNTY FROM COW CASTLE CREEK TO ITS INTERSECTION WITH STATE ROAD 38-168 "WEATHERS FAMILY HIGHWAY" AND ERECT APPROPRIATE SIGNS OR MARKERS ALONG THIS PORTION OF HIGHWAY CONTAINING THESE WORDS.

Returned with concurrence.

Received as information.

S. 605 -- Senator Allen: A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO REQUEST THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION NAME THE PORTION OF AUGUSTA STREET IN THE CITY OF GREENVILLE FROM ITS INTERSECTION WITH UNITED STATES HIGHWAY 29 TO ITS INTERSECTION WITH SOUTH MAIN STREET "FRED D. GARRETT, SR. MEMORIAL HIGHWAY" AND ERECT APPROPRIATE SIGNS OR MARKERS ALONG THIS PORTION OF HIGHWAY CONTAINING THESE WORDS.

Returned with concurrence.

Received as information.

S. 606 -- Senators Garrett and Gambrell: A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO **REQUEST** THE **DEPARTMENT** OF TRANSPORTATION NAME THE PORTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA HIGHWAY 34 IN THE CITY OF GREENWOOD IN GREENWOOD COUNTY FROM ITS INTERSECTION WITH UNITED STATES HIGHWAY 25 TO ITS INTERSECTION WITH VINTAGE COURT "JOHN MCELRATH MEMORIAL HIGHWAY" AND ERECT APPROPRIATE SIGNS OR MARKERS AT THIS LOCATION CONTAINING THESE WORDS.

Returned with concurrence.

Received as information.

S. 628 -- Senator Corbin: A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO REQUEST THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION NAME THE PORTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA HIGHWAY 11 FROM ITS JUNCTION WITH TUGALOO AND SMITH ROADS TO THE INTERSECTION WITH SOUTH CAROLINA HIGHWAY 14 IN GREENVILLE COUNTY "DEAN STUART CAMPBELL, SQUIRE OF THE DARK CORNER SCENIC MEMORIAL BYWAY" AND ERECT APPROPRIATE MARKERS OR SIGNS AT THIS LOCATION CONTAINING THE DESIGNATION.

Returned with concurrence.

Received as information.

S. 648 -- Senator Grooms: A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO REQUEST THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES NAME THE HERITAGE PRESERVE ON CAPERS ISLAND THE "GEORGE E. CAMPSEN, JR. CAPERS ISLAND HERITAGE PRESERVE" AND ERECT MARKERS OR SIGNS AT THIS LOCATION CONTAINING THIS DESIGNATION.

Returned with concurrence.

Received as information.

S. 659 -- Senators Matthews, Senn, Cromer, Hutto, Campsen, Adams, Alexander, Allen, Bennett, Cash, Climer, Corbin, Davis, Fanning, Gambrell, Garrett, Goldfinch, Grooms, Gustafson, Harpootlian, Hembree, Jackson, K. Johnson, M. Johnson, Kimbrell, Kimpson, Loftis, Malloy, Martin, Massey, McElveen, McLeod, Peeler, Rankin, Reichenbach, Rice, Sabb, Scott, Setzler, Shealy, Stephens, Talley, Turner, Verdin, Williams and Young: A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO REQUEST THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF

TRANSPORTATION NAME THE BRIDGE LOCATED AT U.S. 17 OVER THE ASHEPOO RIVER IN COLLETON COUNTY "COUNCILMAN W. GENE WHETSELL BRIDGE" AND ERECT APPROPRIATE MARKERS OR SIGNS AT THIS LOCATION CONTAINING THE DESIGNATION.

Returned with concurrence.

Received as information.

# **ADJOURNMENT**

At 11:09 A.M., on motion of Senator McELVEEN, the Senate adjourned to meet tomorrow at 11:00 A.M., under the provisions of Rule 1B.

\* \* \*

# THURSDAY, APRIL 6, 2023 SENATE JOURNAL INDEX

S. 230	47	Н. 3786	.38
S. 491	48	Н. 3810	.38
S. 589	48	Н. 3865	.38
S. 604	47	Н. 3870	.39
S. 605	48	Н. 3877	.39
S. 606	49	Н. 3908	.39
S. 628	49	Н. 4017	.40
S. 648	49	Н. 4020	.40
S. 659	49	Н. 4040	.40
		Н. 4087	.41
Н. 3138	34	Н. 4096	.41
Н. 3514	34	Н. 4115	.42
Н. 3558	35	Н. 4116	.43
Н. 3563	35	Н. 4118	.45
Н. 3681	36	Н. 4124	45
Н. 3690	36	Н. 4207	.46
Н. 3691	37	Н. 4279	.46
Н. 3737	37		