

SENATOR WARNER: The Clerk will verify the vote.

CLERK: (Roll call vote taken. See page 1163 of the Legislative Journal.) 24 ayes, 13 nays on the amendment, Mr. President.

SENATOR WARNER: The motion is lost. Further amendments on the desk.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Withem would move to amend the bill.

SENATOR WARNER: Senator Withem.

SENATOR WITHEM: Is this amendment 797?

SENATOR WARNER: The call is raised. Excuse me, Senator Withem.

CLERK: I'm sorry, Senator.

SENATOR WITHEM: Amendment 797?

CLERK: Yes, sir.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, I plan on withdrawing this amendment but I do want to share with you some of my thoughts on why I had offered this originally. First of all, this is one of those many bills which starts out as a simple little bill and then becomes a major controversy over things that really aren't that controversial, that people read portions of them and think that they're doing stuff that they're not doing. This is a bill, in its entirety, that was brought to us by the Accountability and Disclosure Commission. They have a concern about there is some ambiguity in the statutes dealing with this old question of honorarium. They were the ones that said they wanted it cleared up. Somehow in the newspapers there is this impression that there is a group of legislators who are trying to open the honorarium thing wide open. In actuality, it's pretty wide open as it is now. LB 232 really does provide, in addition to some clarifications, at least the reporting provision. My reaction to that whole situation was, let's just leave the situation currently as it exists dealing with honorarium and that was what this amendment would have done. It would have struck all reference to honorarium from any changes in the honorarium statute from this particular provision. Since then, however, I have seen an amendment Senator Beutler will be offering which I