

I were talking about where they try to construe the Constitution? If they were going to make a finding, why shouldn't they, in a coherent manner, make that their statement and not a part of the operative language of the law? Then if the court said this is an incorrect interpretation of the Constitution, it could be ignored, because it is not operative language. So what has been done is to put in this statement of findings things that people may or may not disagree with. It is a lot less mischievous than the original. But wouldn't it be better to just leave subsection 2, as I want to do, then indicate that this act is to be construed in accord with the provisions of Article VIII, Section whatever it is, to accomplish the purposes of this act, and let that be the only statement of findings or whatever they want to have. What do you think about something like that?

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Chambers, I'm comfortable with the language that's before us. I'm not comfortable with striking the findings language. I'm relying on advice from people who are attorneys, I am not one, who tell me that it is important to have findings and declarations within language like this where we're implementing a constitutional provision as to what the rationale of the Legislature was, so I'm not comfortable with striking it.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Withem, you taught American History, did you, and Government?

SPEAKER WITHEM: Yes, I did.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And you probably retain an interest not only in history but current events and those that are relatively current.

SPEAKER WITHEM: I'm losing that interest as I go along, but...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I can understand that, I can understand that. Now you're relying on information and advice that you got from people who have, in your opinion, more expertise in this area than you have.

SPEAKER WITHEM: That's correct.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Do you remember a president named John F. Kennedy?