

February 19, 1991

consideration to that provision of the statute that said the only thing before us was what was filed in the election contest.

SENATOR ASHFORD: Thank you, Senator Warner. It's my...I think Senator Landis has, quite frankly, said it quite well and that is that there are at least two issues here. One is the intent of the voter issue and what is...what is the law or what do the legal precedents present. And I think most of the debate today has been on the issue of voter intent and a wide ranging series of arguments about the fact that we cannot disenfranchise voters. The argument on legal precedent though, I think, is also applicable to this discussion as well because all of the cases in Nebraska, starting with the first case in 1905, talked about the fact that the standard of law to be applied is one to ensure as much as possible that voters not be disenfranchised. Therefore, the arguments about the intent of the voters match quite well with the long line of precedent of Nebraska cases. Now the cases have come down on both sides of the issues but the long line of precedent is clearly consistent with what the general tenor of the debate was here today and I have argued that line of precedent and that is why I voted, contrary to what Senator Chambers has said, I have voted to enfranchise or to allow those five hundred or so votes to be counted because I think there was substantial compliance. I think the clear reading of all of the precedent would dictate to me, as an attorney anyway, that those votes must be cast. Now Senator Warner has said that the Executive Board did not hear evidence on the issue or very little evidence on the issue of the 95 ballots. I think what that tells me is that we do not have a full and complete picture of what happened in Gage County in this case. I'm not concerned about the other Gage County cases. I'm not concerned about the election for this office or that office. But what I am concerned about is that all of the voters, as long as we're not talking about slick ballots, that means ballots which were not initialed and could easily be interpreted as being ballots that were stuffed, and those are what are called slick ballots, I think the Executive Board needs to complete the process. The fact that they have not done it yet should not preclude them from doing it now. And the fact that Senator Landis raises it now and didn't raise it before, or someone else didn't raise it before is not really a reason not to consider it. I would feel much more comfortable and the old theory that...

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.