

and not constitutional. Findings are for the purpose of telling what the legislative intent is, in case there is some ambiguity in the act. But the ultimate decision is for the court to make. So, Senator Lamb, putting that provision into the bill, will not be the determining factor as to whether or not the court would strike down the entire bill if one part of it was found to be unconstitutional. What the court has said is whether there is a severability clause or not. It will give effect to whatever part of a piece of legislation it can that is constitutional, unless the portion that is struck down was the inducement for passage of the entire bill. So, whether you put a severability clause on or not, the court will salvage what it can from a bill, unless the bad part was the inducement for passing the part that could have stood without that part that was struck down. If you have what Senator Lamb calls a reverse severability clause, that cannot be a limitation on the court's jurisdiction to consider the bill or dictate to the court how it must rule on it. So what we're seeing here, in my opinion, is what happens when people get together and don't really trust each other, they're trying to...everybody wants to have a gun on everybody else and they are always shooting blanks anyway. So, if Senator Lamb feels better because you've given him a teddy bear to snuggle up under the covers with when it gets dark and somebody tells him there might be a monster under the bed, let him have his teddy bear. On the other hand, if you're mean, snatch it away from him, take his security blanket. But I think before people make announcements to the public that they have reached an agreement, they should first know whether or not they can trust each other. That's why I like the terms Bonnie and Clyde, Calamity Jane and the Dalton Brothers, the Buccaneers, because inherent in those terms is the idea that these are people who don't really trust each other. So the announcement was made and banner headlines, in all three newspapers, that the deal had been struck. They use more dignified terminology than that. Then we come here and we spend all afternoon Friday on this bill, and the ones who have worked together to strike the deal can't even tell us what the deal is that they struck, and Senator Lamb has put in a provision saying nobody in the deal is trustworthy. (Laugh.) This bill probably should be allowed to pass just the way it is without any additional amendment, because the court is entitled to a little levity, too. And I think they get no more enjoyment than when they read a bill like this that the Legislature has labored over so long and expended so much brain power to come up with. So, whether his provision stays in or not, I don't think will determine how the court will