

SENATOR CHAMBERS: He's on his way to his mike.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Wonder why they call it a mike. Should call it an Ernie or a Chris or something. (Laughter.)

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, it couldn't be called an Ernie because a mike only transmits that which somebody else puts into it. Ernie is a creator and a generator. But, anyway, Senator Beutler, let's...

SENATOR BEUTLER: An egotist.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Definitely. Let's look, with reason, Senator Beutler, with this subparagraph 4 in your amendment, it begins by saying, for the purposes of these sections honorarium shall mean a payment to a public official for a service which he or she is not legally required to perform by reason of his or her public office. That means we cannot be paid for that which we're legally required to do. Correct?

SENATOR BEUTLER: That's right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, so that's out of the way. Now, here's what an honorarium is. Given to a public official, if it bears a reasonable relationship to the value of the services rendered by the official, and that service must be something not required by the law for us to do as public officials. Is that correct?

SENATOR BEUTLER: That's right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: You're a lawyer. You're a public official. When you give consultation or function as a lawyer and you're given pay, you're given something of value. Based on this definition, since you're a public official, you're being paid something for what you are rendering, your receipt of money as a lawyer is an honorarium under this definition, isn't it?

SENATOR BEUTLER: You could make that interpretation, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Based on what the language says, let's not interpret it. Is it...is there a reasonable relationship between the value of the services you rendered and that you receive as a lawyer?