

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

April 11, 2000 LR 367

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Schrock. Senator Dierks.

SENATOR DIERKS: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the Legislature. I came to this body 14 years ago, and one of the very first lobbyists that I met was Jack Mills. I was on the Government Committee at the time, and Jack spent quite a little bit of time before that committee. He is one of those stars, I think, among the lobby group. He does exactly the things that I think should happen by a lobbyist. He represents his people very well. He understands the issues, he presents them forthrightly. He tells you...he tells you the good part and he tells you the bad part. He tells you who will be opposed and who is in favor, and it's the things that I just appreciate in a lobbyist. He is a very honorable man, and I consider him a very close friend. He's been a good confidant of mine since I came here, and I just appreciate him very much. I will miss him, and I think we'll all miss him. And I also want to say that I'll miss Norma. She has always been very...a very friendly, a very close person to me. She's always greeted me with the same smile. They are a great couple and I, too, am sorry to see them leave, and I wish them the very best. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Dierks. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I don't even think of Jack Mills as a lobbyist. I think of him as an ambassador, plenipotentiary, diplomat extraordinary. He does not approach issues in the way that one of those individuals defined and described as a lobbyist would do. I have seen him take positions before various committees which required delicate handling because sometimes the group that would send him to speak on a bill had not completely thought it through. So it became necessary for Jack, for Mr. Mills, to explain the issue more clearly. And I think his having been a member of the Legislature put him in a position to understand how committees, as a whole and as individual thinkers, senators would think. So he could present a better picture than the organization he represented was able to present. Then he could take a senator aside and explain in greater detail, if the senator desired such an explanation. So it was not a situation