

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. And the alternative that's presented in this bill, could you explain to us a little bit what limitations there would be on honorarium under the proposed bill?

SENATOR WITHEM: I believe there are none under the proposed bill. The requirement would be that of reporting.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay, so if somewhere down the line somebody, because they no longer care, they're going out of office or for whatever reason, wanted to receive an honorarium for \$1,000 for walking down to the University Club and giving a five-minute speech on the condition of the Legislature, they could do so under this bill and the only requirement would be to disclose it. Is that correct?

SENATOR WITHEM: That would be my understanding.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. Would you be amenable, Senator, to consideration of alternatives perhaps either retaining the current law or some kind of cap on honorariums or maybe doing away with honorariums altogether, depending on how they're defined?

SENATOR WITHEM: I would be agreeable to doing something...something else other than...I'm not wedded to the specific language in this bill. I share some of your concerns about honoraria and the potential for abuse in that sort of situation and the situation you described, I would not be supportive of. I would not be supportive of doing away with them altogether...

SENATOR WARNER PRESIDING

SENATOR WARNER: One minute.

SENATOR WITHEM: ...partially because that was, you know, not a matter that was brought before us and I would hate to because we've been lectured so severely by the Omaha World-Herald about amending bills that are putting in ideas that were not brought up in committee, I would feel reluctant to do that. But...and I don't know if the current statute is a good one either. But some way so we can assure that there are no abuses so that if an individual gets an honorarium, it's actually consistent with what's paid to other speakers at a conference and not just