

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

April 10, 2000 LB 1021

the amendment that's being reconsidered I certainly would like to hear them. It's not my intent to cause anybody problems or confusion. But in terms of examples that are examples that make this law unwise, there has not been a single one related on the floor so far. Senator Engel's example of a wife who got \$1,000 from a principal, the rule is \$50. It was before this bill, it will be after this bill, so that particular thing will be in violation whether or not you have my amendment. My amendment doesn't make any difference. All this area deals with are lobbyists and principals, and so I will be interested in what examples you think make this policy unwise, but I would ask you to at least think in terms of real examples. If there are real problems out there, okay, let's reconsider it. But if the amendment still makes sense don't mix up the arguments on this amendment with the things that you found troublesome about the other amendment, because that...that deals with a completely different area of gifts, gifts unrelated to lobbyists and principals. This particular area we already have a law of \$50 a month and the amendment that you approved is not going to affect any of the examples that have thus far been given on the floor that you would like to allow for. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Landis, on the motion to reconsider.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I rise to support the motion to reconsider from Senator Smith, Senator Kremer and others. Understand apparently we have a \$50 maximum. All right, it's a fact of life. You live with it. I live with it. Senator Beutler's amendment says, but even though that rule, which says 50 bucks is okay but over 50 bucks is not okay, if you did that 7 times in a row it would all of a sudden not be okay. Why? To do exactly what the law permits repetitively would all of a sudden not be okay. What is that all about? Where is the logic that says you may follow this rule six times in a row but the seventh time in a row it's a crime? It's because we're in this crazy quilt of trying to catch people by these standards or numbers or amounts and use those as the way of what's determining right or wrong. You know what's wrong? It's when you trade any amount of money for any amount of decision making and 50 bucks doesn't solve that one bit, or 300, or 600, or a thousand. If somebody in here sold influence for