

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

April 4, 2000

LB 1021

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, again, speaking as a practical politician, here is what I would like to see happen, and that doesn't mean it's going to happen, I'm not going to be upset with anybody if it doesn't happen, but some of these concepts are new to all of us, interpretations that may have been made upstairs that we were not aware of. What I would rather see happen is that we discuss some of these ideas, so we know what is before us, but not necessarily adopt them as amendments to the bill, when we're not sure exactly what the implications will be and how they'll tie into the rest of the bill. In the same way that there were meetings that resulted in the basic amendment, which has become the bill, we could have the interested people, between now and Select File, talk about these various ideas that are being proposed as individual amendments and make sure that they will dovetail, that we know what it is that we're discussing, make sure that we're not putting something in maybe a reporting area for the senators and other officials that maybe ought to be in the lobbyist's reporting area. The reason I say this, those who have worked on this bill probably have a much better grasp of these things than the rest of us have. And it took them a while to arrive at the form of the amendment that has become the bill. But the rest of us were not involved in all of that developmental discussion, so we still, in a manner of speaking, are at ground zero, where we need to have things explained to us, shown...we need to have them...we need to be shown how they blend with the remainder of the law. So, I'm not going to vote for these amendments right now, not that I'm opposed to them, but I would like to see us work our way through them, other than on the floor, when it is brand new to us. What Senator Beutler mentioned did sound good to me at first, then I listened to what others said. What Senator Beutler is suggesting is that the way the language appears now, a lobbyist could give 1,000 a gifts a month, no one of which was more than \$50, and that would not be in violation of the law, because you were not given a gift exceeding \$50 in value. So, it's a point that I think needs additional discussion before an amendment is adopted. One amendment that was adopted substituted the term "an item of value" for the word "gift", and I voted for that amendment. But after it was called to my attention, maybe what we should not do is change...is substitute words where the word being substituted