

SENATOR PIRSCH: So, to that end, you left honorarium in, on page 7, feeling that it has already been identified.

SENATOR WITHEM: My amendment reinserts, on page 7, line 23, the word "honorarium".

SENATOR PIRSCH: Right. I guess I'm wondering why, if you are not putting in a definition, why you were leaving in the word itself.

SENATOR WITHEM: Because my intent, Senator Pirsch, is to leave statutes exactly as they are, because this question of honorarium is not well understood here on the floor today, and we're taking a lot of time with and there's a lot of other good things in the bill I'd like to see passed.

SENATOR PIRSCH: Oh. I do, too. I don't think there is anything wrong with this. I guess, what we are all hung up on, though, is the definition. And I think your amendment at least helps in that end.

SENATOR WARNER: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Withem, a question, if I may. As you know, you had put into the bill a reporting requirement and included honorarium under that reporting requirement. Are you now eliminating that reporting requirement?

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, I am.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. So that the old language would pertain which says that a detailed statement of any money, loaned, promised, or paid by a lobbyist to a legislator, or to anyone on his or her staff, so that's what would have to be reported now, is that right?

SENATOR WITHEM: I...on page 5, what...all this amendment does is it strikes the word honorarium on line 5, excuse me, on line 6. So all this other new information will still stay in the bill, indicating what needs to be reported, but honorarium will not be.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Well, under the law, as it existed, as I understand it, there was some confusion as to whether honorarium