

1 process approach. We feel that this is the meaningful
2 way to test this, and this is what the law of the State
3 should be.

4 DR. BURDETTE: I don't mean to belabor this,
5 but I would like to press the point a bit that if the
6 court could have the benefit of what the General Assembly
7 thought the purpose was, we would be better off. I think
8 the public would be better off. I remember a case in the
9 Kentucky highest court in which it held that, as I recall
10 my very small legal training, that a statute was not a
11 public purpose, but I had a feeling in reading the case
12 that, this is a commemorative statute to a war hero. If
13 the Legislature had spelled out where it was public pur-
14 pose, it might have got through the courts, but I think
15 there is another point beyond the lawyers' point, sir, that
16 the General Assembly should really be required to put
17 the cards on the table of what it thinks it is doing.
18 I concede it may be obscure in its language at times, but
19 still some language ought to be used.

20 MR. CASE: I am not going to debate it. I
21 don't think it is necessary, not when you are incurring