

and things like that, but I think that you are coming up with a wrong solution to this problem. I feel that the correct solution is a constitutional amendment that will correct the wording in our Constitution. I feel that if we override the Governor's veto this issue will wind up in the courts and of course we know how much money that is going to cost us. It is going to cost us thousands of dollars. Also, I am positive that we would jeopardize Senator Labedz' and Senator Johnson's bill which they have introduced asking for approval by the people to increase our salaries and I can certainly agree with you that we need an increase. I feel that this bill that Senator Chambers has attempts to circumvent the Constitution. The public is smart out there. They know what is going on down here and I don't think they like it. I don't think that they like to be hoodwinked. Our Constitution says very plainly one trip down and one trip back and that is it and then too, it goes against my principle. I think we are twisting these words around and so, I say to this body this morning, let your conscience be your guide. Senator Chambers is doing what he feels is right but in my mind I think it is wrong. I think the right way is to pass a bill that will bring this to a vote of the people, a constitutional amendment saying that we need expenses, our expenses covered. Therefore, I would urge you this morning to vote against this motion to override the Governor's veto.

**SPEAKER MARVEL:** Senator Vard Johnson.

**SENATOR V. JOHNSON:** Mr. Speaker, members of the body, I only have a couple of remarks to make in support of Senator Chambers to override the Governor's veto on LB 206. The first remark I want to say is this, I think the Legislature is entitled to go to court once in a while. You know, we never do get to go to court. We sit here and we pass a law and obviously the Attorney General from time to time tells us the law that we pass is unconstitutional but it isn't up to us to get to go to court on that law. We don't have any chance to go to court on that law. If somebody wants to take the law to court they can take the law to court and a court can decide it but you and I are not in the driver's seat on that. Well this expense issue is one that has been hanging fire for a long time and we have, I guess been wriggling on the turning spit, so to speak, of the 1937 Attorney General's opinion. It has never been challenged. How is it to be challenged but for the passage of a law and a case in court? Now I think that is a fair and just thing to do. In terms of the dollars it is going to cost us most litigation in the Nebraska Supreme Court won't generate that great of cost but the amount of cost