

that I have been involved in some things the last couple years and particularly the last couple months and especially the last couple weeks that I felt might generate a potential conflict of interest on the matter, kind of sitting on certain information and for that reason I thought I would just sit it out. I think the information that has been developed to this point now where I am going to vote for the override of the veto as one method of testing it. I don't know if you all remember but I kind of started this with the old Exec Board several years ago when we developed this identical bill and the idea was to force the issue. And the reason I wanted to force the issue was because I have been convinced that we are illegal and have been, that I as a member of the last Exec Board was illegal. The Exec Board was illegal and we are the same way this way. Now, I am voting to override the veto with this understanding, that once you do it you are challenging the whole system and you are going to bring to a head a number of other issues. What am I talking about? I am talking about a whole concept of the Legislative Council and the interim expenses and the whole system. That was created as a special strict device to get expenses and bypass the Constitution and I do not personally see how you can have it legal to collect expenses of doing a job in one case and then say they are illegal when you are really doing the job up front. You create the myth, I am going to use the word the "hoax", that you are somehow serving as not a senator, or whatever when you are a member of the Legislative Council and so then it is okay to get your expenses, so on and so forth. It was for that reason that last summer quite frankly, that I made a matter of record that I did not collect for motel rooms when I stayed in Lincoln, did not collect expenses. I used campaign funds, but the point is other people were getting paid with state tax dollars for the identical thing that I avoided using state tax dollars for and used campaign funds. Okay? Now, I believe that if the veto is overridden you are going to guarantee that the entire system gets challenged because the Attorney General, I am convinced, will not defend on the basis of just expenses during the session. But let's get to the issue of expenses. Can you imagine hiring Bernice Labeledz to come down and run your office and then saying, Bernice, now you get \$3.15 an hour and she would be good like she says, but you provide your own typewriter, you provide the paper, you provide the pencils, you do this and that, in other words you pay the expenses of running my office. In a sense, in a very very direct and real sense that is what they are asking us to do and I don't believe in modern times certainly, that that is what is intended. I believe if you hire somebody to do a job