

be used, floor discussion, committee hearing, to the extent that they were recorded, as how an act was intended to...to be implemented or administrated. And as all good things, and then there was another thing, on occasion, I think, is important for this kind of language, and that is if there is a so-called public purpose that is at issue, or could be at issue, particularly in a court case, you can help define, perhaps, with intent language, the public purpose that is intended to...to be met. But then like all things that are innovations, as they are initiated they tend to become expanded. They tend to become, as has already been pointed out, sometimes editorial in nature rather than as explained...explanatory, as they started out to be. And, of course, I could even think it's gone so far where we've had legislation introduced that was nothing but intent language, that was intended to serve as a vehicle for an A bill to fund an existing program. And that's been done a couple of times, and from my viewpoint was totally inappropriate. In this particular instance, I'm not particularly offended, I guess is the right word, by the language that is in this bill. But I think the whole discussion that has been brought up by Senator Withem is a very appropriate discussion for the Legislature to give thought to, and it ought to be something that...that, when we are looking at bill drafting and committee hearings, that perhaps we spend more time on than sometimes has been the case. So, I appreciate Senator Withem bringing up the issue. I don't think it should be directed at this bill specifically, because this is a much broader issue that...practice that I think has become less than desirable over the years, and one which ought to be restricted in its use to being nothing more than explanatory, if that...in nature to assist in the implementing of legislation, or to clarify that there is, in fact, a public purpose for the legislation that is being proposed.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Warner. Senator Withem.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, members of the body, I'll try not to prolong this, but there are a few things I would like to comment on that have come up in the discussion. One of them is, what is the valid purpose of having intent language in a statute?. It's twofold. One is, if we think, as a Legislature, that there may be some questions by an agency as to how a law is to be administered, that we put the language in the statute in plain, understandable language so that there can be no misinterpretation when it comes time for their administration. I don't think that's applicable in this case. The bill, itself,