

March 11, 1991 LB 232

because sooner or later, one way or another you have to go back to the question of value and if you drop that out of the definition of gift, it makes it a more tenuous connection, I think.

SENATOR WARNER: Senator Withem.

SENATOR WITHEM: That was Senator Kristensen's point that he made. I would feel more comfortable if he responded as opposed to my responding.

SENATOR WARNER: Senator Withem...or Senator Kristensen.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Thank you. Senator Beutler, could you concisely rephrase that?

SENATOR BEUTLER: You made the point that you would have to go back to the definition of gift, regardless, even if you changed this bill to exclude honorarium from the definition of gift. As I understood your point, you were saying that if there were no value given, if it was not a real speech, if it was not a real honorarium that it would still...it would then come under the definition of gift. Is that not what you were saying?

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: I think that's the standard that you balance it against, right. If it's...

SENATOR BEUTLER: Well, my question is would you really balance it against that...

SENATOR WARNER: One minute.

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...because you're dropping those words out of that definition. And if, in fact, you would still balance it, then you're using the same, the very same criteria that are in the definition now so why bother to change?

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: No, I don't think that's true. Senator Beutler, what you have is honorarium that this bill is attempting to remove out of the gift area and say that you report the honoraria that you get so it's a full disclosure sort of thing. As you read the definition in your two different dictionaries, you're still going to have the definition of what's honoraria. Okay, that's still going to be there. The scenario that I think...