

February 19, 1991

really not very much respect even, Mr. Chairman. (Laughter.)

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Withem. Senator Conway.

SENATOR CONWAY: Mr. Speaker, members, I have not risen yet this morning. But I am very concerned about Senator Landis' amendment, for a lot of technical reasons. The amendment simply starts talking about the 95 votes that were not counted at the polls. I would much rather see Senator Withem's discussion of sending it back to the Executive Committee, if in fact we're going to address that, because we've not established any of the parameters by which those 95 will or will not be considered. We don't know whether some of those votes are slick votes, where there was no signature at all, and they were simply stuffed. We don't know whether those that had one signature on them or one initial on them were even initialed by an election official but by a person who got a hold of a blank ballot and put their initials on it. We need those kinds of depositions to qualify, clarify and establish those votes as to whether or not they are legitimate votes. If we go through a process where we know what, then I think I'd be much more comfortable looking at those 95. We don't know anything about those 95, why they were rejected. We talk about significant compliance. We have not established anything about those 95. And to simply pull those in without some parameters, I'm not very comfortable with. As far as an idea in terms of not disenfranchising those voters either, I have no problem with. But I think a motion that simply pulls those up on the table, without some ground rules established, just creates more havoc until we have some of those things established. I would much rather have Senator Landis' motion, if nothing else, amended to describe what will be the rules of the game relative to those 95, because at this point, like I say, I'm not comfortable at all. As incompetent as those election people in Gage County have already proved themselves to be, I assume there was some justification for why they did or didn't have those in the original pot. But I think we ought to establish the ground rules of what those ought to be. So I guess I would stand here and sustain the Chair with the idea of getting to Senator Withem's motion of referring that to the Executive Board and saying, if we're going to consider those 95, let there be some rules that we can scrutinize relative to those 95, and then bring those back into the package. I also think there's a very dangerous precedent here in the sense that I look at election contests, and being a person who went through one a couple of years ago, the very fact that somebody challenges,