

great cries was "Have every man a priest", and he meant very simply that every person was perfectly capable of interpreting the Bible, didn't have to work through any intercessor in interpreting the Bible. Well, I can guarantee you when you read the letter sent out under the signature of Royce Harper for the Attorney General, Paul Douglas, it is easy for every member in this body to be a lawyer. His letter does not cite one case, which incidentally can be found in approximately five minutes, because when the letter came in I went to my Constitution and I found without any question, Article IV, Section 8 dealing with special sessions, and underneath Article IV, Section 8 dealing with special sessions are the four cases that have been before the Nebraska Supreme Court dealing with germaneness and going beyond the call. The only problem was I didn't have access to the Law Library being at that time five-fifteen so I couldn't come up and quick like get those cases but the Attorney General could have gotten those cases and could have given us the benefit of those cases in his letter. But that didn't happen. Instead all that happened is the Attorney General says here is the Constitution, which each of us are perfectly capable of reading and interpreting for ourselves, just as with the Bible, and here is my...and here is the call, which each of us are perfectly capable of reading ourselves and interpreting, and here is my interpretation. And I can guarantee you in the absence of any legal analysis, in the absence of any kind of critical discussion of existing case law, this opinion is meaningless. You and I are as capable as lawyers, as legislators and as laymen of interpreting our Constitution and our call and our actions as is Mr. Royce Harper and as is the Attorney General. Now what is the correct interpretation? If we only read the Constitution, what does the Constitution say? The Constitution says very simply that when it comes to a special session the Legislature effectively is limited to the thrust of the call. And what was the thrust of the call? It was to deal with spending, but more importantly, it was to amend, it was to amend the federal ADC, was to amend the ADC statutes as required by federal law. Now it didn't say it was to amend the ADC statutes in the manner required by federal law. It didn't say it was to amend the ADC statutes as the federal government says the amendment should take effect. It merely said it was to amend the ADC statutes, and it happens to be required by federal law. As you may recall, the federal law says whenever the Legislature next convenes it has got to go back and amend its statutes. That is simply a timing point and so we came and we looked at the ADC statutes and we have amended those ADC statutes and we have amended those statutes in a way which is totally