

the corner and I shot him on the head with a bean shooter and, boy, do I feel good because I fixed the bully. Well, if that's how you get your satisfaction, have at it, but that doesn't do anything for me. And the Legislature is not likely to terrify the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court will say to the Legislature...what Sir Thomas More said when they were trying to intimidate him into taking a position he wouldn't. He said, threats and terrors are for children but not for me. And that's what the court will tell the Legislature.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Witek. There is no need, Senator, there are no further lights. Senator Lindsay to close on the motion to return to Select File.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Thank you, Madam President and members. I think there's two things that, in response to Senator Chambers' questions I think we want to make clear. Number one is, there is a severability clause in the amendment which separates those issues and, clearly, as Senator Chambers has lectured us in the past, the court looks at, was it an integral part of the bill? Very clearly, it's not the factor that makes the bill pass, so I think that a severability clause would have impact, shows the intent that the two portions are severable. The second thing, I think...I don't think amending a bill, if that portion of it is not...is not valid or if the amendment was not correct, again I don't think that is going to bring down the whole bill. Senator Chambers and I obviously disagree on that. And I think the underlying policy, finally, the third issue is, will it have an effect? Senator Chambers may be absolutely correct, and maybe to use his analogy, maybe the bully is going to rub his head when that bean hits his head and call it good and go on being a bully. Maybe...maybe the...maybe I'd better quit talking like this since I'm a member of the Bar. Yeah. The...and then again maybe the question is it will be interpreted and it will be in effect until the bill is...this portion, until and unless that bill is struck down by the Supreme Court and, as we know, they have to have five judges of the Supreme Court agreeing on that a bill is unconstitutional in order to strike that down. And there is a question about whether that would occur. With that, I do not think it jeopardizes the bill. It's certainly not the intent. I think it's very clear to just about everybody in here that they're separate issues and that they can be severed in the case of unconstitutionality of any portion of it. I would urge the bill be returned for a specific amendment.