

February 19, 1991

will be observed that the statutory requirement does not provide the clerk shall place his full name on the ballot but only he shall place his signature thereon." Well, our statute is not the same as the statute in Indiana because our statute very plainly states that the, referring to the election official, shall first write his or her name in full on the back of the ballot; and it goes on to say if that is not done, if the signature does not occur, that the ballot should not be counted. I recognize, as I am sure all of you do, that we have the right to amend the law today, in effect without amending it, but by interpretation. I have concern with the precedent that that will incur. I have thrown out the word "justice" a number of times, not thrown out, that's not the right word, I have used it, because it was not an easy decision on my part. And the question keeps coming up in my mind, there is more than one kind of justice. Now there is a justice in the people being able to expect consistency in the interpretation of ballots. There is a justice in the people being able to anticipate predictability from the statutes. There is a justice involved in a uniform interpretation of the law. And as I read what I have read, I have concluded that the precedent of the law in this case is what must take precedence. I have a genuine concern when the Legislature establishes the practice by amending a law through this kind of process, when the Legislature is willing and intentionally will not follow the law, and I don't know what else might occur at a later date. Next time one could willfully ignore the law in this body that we, ourselves, have done. It seems to me, as difficult as it may be, that the only conclusion that we can come, based upon what I read in the greatest amount and the greatest weight in the court decisions,...

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.

SENATOR WARNER: ...is to come down on the side, and in this case, plainly the statute which required a full name was not followed, and plainly the ballots without the signature should not be counted, and the body is in the position that, yes, perhaps the law ought to be changed in several respects; but the route that we have to follow in changing the law is the one that the Constitution, itself, provides, which is through the introduction of legislation, passage of that act, and then in the final analysis, of course, it is not retroactive, and I find it very difficult to come down on the side that we should just blatantly ignore those words in the statutes, which when you go back and read the legislative 'history' of the bill that was