

weeks before we came down here and I'm not sure but what there is more confusion than before we came down here. I do have a question of Senator DeCamp, if he would yield. Senator DeCamp, your amendment would fit in between Sections 1 and Sections 2 of the original bill #1 and you have laid out what you call the specific language of what the intent of the Legislature is. And I guess I'm curious why you added a Section 3, that if any section in this act or any part of any section shall be declared invalid or unconstitutional, it will not affect the validity and constitutionally the remaining portions thereof. What is suspect in this bill that you had to include that provision?

SENATOR DECAMP: The thing suspect is whether it has two subjects. I feel it is not suspect. The attorneys for Commonwealth receiver asked that this severability section be added. It is somewhat irrelevant whether it is in there or not because it is automatically the rule of court that all laws that get before the court have this section deemed to be a part of the law. In other words, all courts have a standing rule in this state that severability is presumed to be a part of it so I had no objection to them adding it in.

SENATOR PIRSCH: Oh, okay. What were his concerns of what was unconstitutional?

SENATOR DECAMP: His concerns were the thing I pointed out about LB 713 which they essentially verified which was, it was unconstitutional if indeed the four words had been there which gets back to the original...(interruption).

SENATOR PIRSCH: In other words, the appropriation included in the same bill.

SENATOR DECAMP: Sure.

SENATOR PIRSCH: That brings my second question...

SENATOR DECAMP: As to whether it was really for four words or a much deeper problem, it was a much deeper problem.

SENATOR PIRSCH: Yes. I have another question for you. Will an A bill then be necessary for this...

SENATOR DECAMP: No.