

We have had other amendments, constitutional amendments, that were worded cockeyed and it is pretty hard to vote when perhaps we can't even understand it when we are supposed to be knowledgeable about some of these issues. I don't know if the Attorney General is the person to do it. I would think that he would ought to have the ability to write up an idea without getting it so cluttered up that the public could not understand it. I don't know as it makes a great deal of difference whether we vote this up or down but I am just telling you the reasons why it is in there because there were complaints the way it has been done. So if you think those complaints are valid vote against the Koch amendment. Thank you.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, I think I have to support Senator Koch's amendment. There is no assurance that the Attorney General would even know how to write up an amendment. I will give a concrete example. For the last forty years the Attorney General, Attorneys General, have been saying and mimicking like a parrot that legislators cannot get expenses during session. You know that. They have been saying, however, we can get them during the interim. Now that the Attorney General's feelings have been hurt through overriding the Governor's veto on LB 206, did you read what he said in an opinion to Senator DeCamp? That now the Constitution does apply to session and interim and those during the interim are probably unconstitutional also. How can you rely on somebody as changeable as that who has injected emotion, ego and personal considerations into the handling of what he has said is a clear constitutional issue with a clear constitutional answer? He is reversing everything all of those Attorneys General have said for forty years, forty-three years. That opinion, that first one, was issued the year that I was born, 1937, for those of you who may not be aware of that, forty-three years. So why should we trust the Attorney General? Suppose an issue were on the ballot related to the judiciary and the Attorney General is a lawyer, although the Constitution does not require him or her to be a lawyer. They have always been lawyers. How do we know that certain subtle pressures may not come to bear on that and the amendment is drawn in a way that anybody conversing with legal ease would understand but the lay person would not and the lay person could be made to feel from the way the amendment is drafted that it does not even concern the lay people anyway? I do not trust the Attorney General's office with this kind of power. As far as arguments that may occur within the Executive Board relative to the phrasing of an amendment, isn't that what the Executive Board is supposed to be about? A group of opinions