

February 26, 1974

PRESIDENT: Does that answer your question, Senator Carpenter? The chair is not....unless others have specific questions, there is nothing before the house other than the question that Senator Carpenter had of Senator Whitney. If others wish to ask questions, Senator Cavanaugh had his light on first. Senator Cavanaugh and then Senator Nore, in that order. Then Senator Stahmer. Senator Cavanaugh, did you wish to askspeaking on a point of personal privilege?

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: I suppose that's what I'll have to do under the circumstances. Senator Carpenter has made some accusations regarding my conduct, regarding the lobby..... my questioning of lobby procedures as they now exist in which he states that I have suggested that they are dishonest, distrustful, disdainful.....but I have been reluctant to make that accusation specific.....and that I have made serious accusations against lobbyists. I've done none of those things. I introduced a bill that would change and strengthen and clarify the present lobby reporting statutes. The bill was killed in committee. It's the thought of the majority of the members of the committee that there was nothing that needed remedying in the area of lobby reports. My feeling is different than that. My feeling is not that the lobbyists who are practicing their trade in this Body are dishonest, distrustful or disdainful. I have many good friends among them and I consider most...the majority of them very able and honorable men. However, the existing state of the lobby reporting law we have on the books does not lend itself to accurate and uniform interpretation. As a result, the lobby reports that have been filed under that act are not uniform in that lobbyists interpret and reasonably so, the existing law in different fashions as to what is reportable and what is not. The consequence is that the lobbyists are disserved by the law in that they can not uniformly report under it and therefore a lobbyist who are extremely scrupulous in their reports, perhaps over-scrupulous, under existing law, receive a public image of rather large spenders when that may not in fact be the case. And other lobbyists may, by not interpreting the law quite as stringently, report a good deal less when they're spending a good deal more. I think it's...under the statute, it's the responsibility of the Committee on Committees to review the reports and to request additional information. And I believe the spirit of the law would be to instruct various lobbyists in the uniformity of interpretation of the present law, even if....my suggestions as to clarifications and strengthening of the law were not accepted, I think that is a necessary thing to do, both to serve the lobbyists and to serve the public. Now, I have not observed here any specific activities that I consider inappropriate, dishonest or disdainful. There is a good deal of entertainment that transpires in this Body among the members and between the lobbyists. A good deal of that entertainment is a necessary concomitant to the work that is done here, in that it consists of evening dinners and evening social affairs in which a good deal of information is derived from the lobbyists. I think that is probably quite appropriate and quite human and quite necessary. But the fact is that they...the Legislature did make the judgment when they passed the original lobby law that the public was entitled to know the extent, at least in a dollar amount, of how much of that influence and it is influence peddling. The lobbyists' jobs are to influence our opinions on specific legislation and their employers supply them with funds in which to do that in a social and entertainment context in order that they may develop relationships with us that will provide them with the opportunity to influence our decisions. And it's the judgment and I think a valid public judgment that the people are entitled to know the monetary extent of that influence exerted and by whom it's exerted. And that is the entire focused and thrust of my