

want it very clear that communities may make that choice, they are not obligated to in any way, but they may do that, if they so designate. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Abboud. Senator Chambers, please.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, members of the Legislature, I'd like to Senator Abboud a question.

PRESIDENT: Senator Abboud, please.

SENATOR ABOUD: Yes, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Abboud, in the constitutional sense of germaneness, is it your understanding that this amendment could be added to this bill without it resulting in two subjects being contained in one bill?

SENATOR ABOUD: Well, that's my belief.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And this isn't to use trickery on my part, have you checked it with anybody, like the Attorney General?

SENATOR ABOUD: Well, that particular opinion didn't deal with it. We added the severability clause onto this amendment just to protect the other bills that are a part of LB 656 already.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. Members of the Legislature, the way the Supreme Court will construe a statute is to make as much of it....First of all, the presumption is that a statute passed by the Legislature is constitutional. If it deals with one subject matter, and there are some portions of it that are not constitutional, and those portions were not the incentive for passing the bill, then those portions will be eliminated and the court will preserve what it can. But, if that unconstitutional provision was the basis for the enactment of the legislation, the whole bill is struck down. When it comes to two subjects in a bill, I don't think the severability clause will work because the Constitution prohibits putting two subjects in a bill, and I think that would cause the bill, itself, to be struck down. So, before I would vote to add this amendment, with which I have no disagreement as far as the contents of it, from what I see in looking at it, I'm not going to vote to add it to this bill because I think 656 is too important in what it does. Now, if