

prerogatives really is. Is he going to be the one who is our lawyer? He is representing us in a case challenging our expenses and he writes a public statement that contradicts the method by which the validity of our expenses is determined, even though his office is involved in that process. The Attorney General's office is involved in the auditing process of our expense records, and then he writes in an Attorney General's Opinion. Some of you all think this is not important, you don't pay attention to it, but I do, and it's why I think I get some respect that others don't. People see me as a thinker, as somebody who reads and understands the law and will apply the law. And I'm going by what the Attorney General has said. So since he has taken those positions, although invalidly, it seems to me that court is where we will go if we adopt Senator Landis and Senator Ashford's water-carrying amendment because they leave the bulk of what is currently in 579 intact. And the Attorney General's Opinion attacks virtually everything in 579. So if you simply say, we will strike the power of the Legislature to hire a private auditor, you have still left practically everything in the bill and he has attacked practically everything in the bill, so how can there not be a court challenge? If there is a challenge and the law is upheld, which we enact, which I believe it will, let it be the law that we want and that law gives us the power to contract with whom we feel is appropriate to do the auditing for us. Senator Vrtiska didn't stand and tell us that his county went down the drain because a county clerk was doing the auditing of their records. But when we come to the Legislature, we join in the easy...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...attacks against the Legislature because we will get an editorial. Senator Vrtiska will get one now, because he is standing for the right of the public to know. To know what? They're not going to know anything about my business, Senator Vrtiska, no matter what you, the media or anybody else says. And before people get the impression that this is a matter that relates only to the dispute with the Auditor, they've got another think coming. It is much broader than this dispute. This dispute merely underlines and is symptomatic of the attempt by people in other branches of government to erode the power of the Legislature, and if we go along with it, we will participate in the self-destruction of this body of which we're members, and I don't think that is appropriate. This amendment that I'm offering gives the