

on the books. I don't think there ought to be access to people's records without a court order when they're maintained by a telephone company. See, the phone company is a for-profit corporation, it's not an agency of government. You are guaranteed privacy. That's why you would have to get the court order. But to see if those Lincoln senators, if there are any, who feel somewhat above the fray, are willing to put themselves in the same situation where constituents who call them will be phoned by the Auditor, then we'll see that we are indeed in the same boat. The question that has troubled me throughout, Senator Vrtiska, and those others who think we ought to just give the Auditor carte blanche is his statement that he wants to be able to call people who call us. Well, if you get calls of no consequence, it doesn't make any difference. They say, well, yeah, knowing what my senator is, I would expect anybody to call me, reporters and everybody else asking me what I'm talking about. But people who have calls of substance will call me and say, Ernie, I call you because you will protect my confidentiality and I've said I'll go to jail before I will reveal or break a confidence and I mean it. And as far as these self-righteous, namby-pamby reporters running around here worried about the repeal of the shield law, should that be repealed, they are not prevented from using any source that they choose. They're not prevented from printing anything they want, but they're subject to the same laws as we are. If you refuse to reveal information that a court orders you to reveal, you've got to go to jail just like I would, just like I would. And when I take these positions, I mean them. And based on what the Attorney General said in his opinion, and since he likes to call people liars, if you turn to page 12 of his opinion, he first of all cites a case which is not on point. But this is a direct quote. "This case is directly applicable to any attempt by the Nebraska Legislature to prevent the State Auditor from auditing legislative phone records, expense accounts, or other claims paid from the State Treasury." How in the world is the Attorney General, who represents us as our lawyer, going to put in a public document like this a statement that goes contrary to the position he is maintaining as our lawyer in court? I believe that it is unethical for a lawyer who is on a retainer...who has a client to publicly express an opinion against the interests of that client and that's what the Attorney General has done. And he has challenged people to file complaints. I'm going to let this be tested. And you all in this Legislature need to wipe the sleep out of your eyes and get the ear wax out of your ears and understand how serious this question of the Legislature's