

ments to it and passage on second reading; all prior to final action on the Budget Bill. Subsequent parliamentary maneuvers, commencing with recommitment of the Bill, in an attempt to nullify the premature and admittedly unconstitutional action, gave no further consideration to the amendments which had been voted into the Bill, and at least one of which, made a material change in it. The amendments all appear in the final third reading copy of the Bill, but were never *legally* adopted in the House, within the purview of the constitutional prohibition.

Under one view, the amendments remained in the Bill after it was recommitted and continuously thereafter. If this interpretation is accepted, the Bill in unconstitutional because the legislative vote upon the amendments preceded passage of the budget.

The only possible alternative conclusion is that reconsideration and recommitment of the measure erased all legislative action on the Bill, including the amendments prematurely adopted. This result would likewise render the measure unconstitutional since the House took no action to restore the amendments which appear in the final third reading copy of the Bill, while the Senate passed the Bill, with the amendments. Consequently, they either must be taken to have passed different version of the same bill, or that the Bill, so amended, did not receive the number of readings in the House which the Constitution requires. After careful study of the opinion, I concur in the Attorney General's conclusion, which appears to be based on careful research and sound legal analysis.

It has been suggested that despite the opinion of the Attorney General, I nevertheless have the power to sign this Bill and thus shift the constitutional question to a court for determination. Such a court test would be assured because no underwriting firm could possibly accept bonds issued by authority of this Bill without a final judicial ruling. I do not choose to avoid my responsibility by shifting it to others, nor, in view of the clear unconstitutionality of the measure, do I feel that its signing would be consistent with my oath of office. Furthermore, such an irresponsible course of action would merely serve to prolong for an additional period of time a snare and delusion based on false hopes sought to be inspired in our war veterans, through this measure. These brave citizens who honorably served their state and nation are worthy of honest treatment by public officials. I cannot agree to aid and abet, nor myself indulge in, political trickery to win their support. I believe that the veterans of this state are not so naive as to misunderstand