

Senator Chizek voting yes. Senator Lindsay voting yes. Senator Crosby voting yes. Senator Moore voting yes. Senator Schellpeper voting yes. Senator Peterson voting yes. Senator Labeledz voting yes. Senator Ashford voting yes.

SENATOR WARNER: Clerk will record.

CLERK: 25 ayes, 2 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

SENATOR WARNER: Motion is carried. Debate is ceased. Senator Beutler, do you wish to close?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature,...

SENATOR WARNER: Excuse me, Senator Beutler. The call is raised. Go ahead, Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, this amendment does not represent any kind of radical departure in any direction, nor does it clean up all of the confusion. I don't think that that is possible to do in the context of where we are right now with this bill. And it would take a great deal of thought and consideration to clean up all the confusion. But, if you don't adopt this amendment, you will have an equal amount of confusion on most of the things we're talking about. And beyond that, there will be no limitation whatsoever on honoraria. I don't think you want to be there. Senators are not required to report. The reporting that we're talking about here has to do with reporting by lobbyists, not by senators. Okay. So separate that out in your mind and recognize that under current law lobbyists are already required to report arguably all honorarium anyway. And this amendment merely clarifies that aspect of the bill also, also. So with the amendment what we're saying, we're making it clear that you can accept honorarium. That is not clear under the current law. We're making it clear that you can, and then we're saying that there has to be some reasonable relationship to the services rendered. Maybe later on in this debate today, or the next round of debate maybe we need to further define and refine. I'm certainly open to that. But I think as to the choices before you at this moment it is better to have a limitation on honorarium as arguably we have, under our current law, but not under 232 in its unamended form, than it is to debate from current law and have no limitation whatsoever on honoraria. So, with that, I would ask you to adopt the amendment and then we