

February 19, 1991

than the amount of the number of ballots that have been thrown out that are not before us. You do not know what the number of people in the 30th District would have done. Voter intent will not solve this problem. What is left but the rule of law. Voter intent will not get you to conclusions. Constitutional arguments, by the way, they're not before us, for the most part, Senator Kristensen, we shouldn't be listening to them under that theory but it just doesn't apply. Under a literal reading that says there's to be no impediment, any registration law would be unconstitutional. We know that's not so. What that means is you can't have a poll tax, you can't have a test when you walk in the door, you can't be physically barred like they used to do in the frontier days. That's what the constitutional provision is about. It's not relevant here. All of this system of law is constitutional. There's been 80 years of interpretation and at no time has there been a constitutional challenge to this statute, it is constitutional. What about substantial compliance? Best argument. Best argument. Very well put, I thought, by Senator Ashford. We are judges, not lawmakers. Debating the question of substantial compliance, to me, the best precedent in the case to guide me on substantial compliance is Mommson v. School District in which the ballot required the endorsing of the name of the election official and the title. The election official wrote her name, Mrs. Thompson. The court threw it out, not substantial compliance, not substantial compliance. All right. Now, if we are at a loss here, who else has helped us guide the substantial compliance? Two judges, who make this their business, they both said there's not been substantial compliance. We've had the chief law enforcement official of this state, the Attorney General, say there's not been substantial compliance, don't count the 555. We've had the chief election official in this state, the Secretary of State, say, no, substantial compliance hasn't been present, don't count the 555 votes. The three people who have put us in this position are defeated political officeholders who said count some of but not all of the absentee ballots in the 30th District. In the end, you have no...you have no handle to grasp with voter intent. You do not have an answer in the Constitution. This is not unconstitutional provisions. Substantial compliance has not been met by the standards of past cases or by the cases of the two judges who have been...who have ruled in this case. What do you have to reach out and hold? You have the words of the statute, the law passed by this body, and if you don't like that one clear handle, then change it, don't ignore it. Senator Lamb said, what if you were a judge