

February 19, 1991

later Supreme Court case, the Supreme Court said as follows: It is insisted that the case of Rasp vs. McHugh is authority for rejecting all of the mail votes, as was done in this case. In the Rasp case, it appears that the box containing the mail votes was turned over to a group of unnamed office employees, who took the box to another room and reported the totals to the canvassing board. In that case, the count was done by not an official counter. There was a violation of the statute in Rasp. In the McMaster case, the court cited what seems to be the law in the State of Nebraska today, accepting the fact as Senator Loran Schmit does, that the absentee voter has a privilege and not a right. It is a privilege and not a right under our law. It says that the duties of election officers in the matter of canvassing...

SENATOR MORRISSEY: One minute.

SENATOR ASHFORD: ...ballots are generally held to be ministerial, are generally held to be ministerial and not mandatory, and the cases go on. In the case of Haggard vs. Misko, it says the same thing, that the right of absentee and disabled voters to cast their ballots at election is purely statutory. A statute conferring such a right will be strictly construed and its provisions are mandatory as to the voter. As long as the voter complies under the law, that those votes should be counted, but when we look at the ministerial acts of voting officials, we apply under every case in the reported cases in the State of Nebraska the doctrine of substantial compliance. In the two latest cases, the Vlach case,...

SENATOR MORRISSEY: Time.

SENATOR ASHFORD: ...those cases, there was not substantial compliance. We must judge each case, and I believe in this case clearly there has been substantial compliance with the statute.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: Thank you. Senator Wesely, followed by Senator Lindsay.

SENATOR WESELY: Mr. President, members, I appreciate Senator Ashford's comments. I appreciate all of the previous individuals who commented on this issue. I think we have held the debate to a high standard and I hope I can continue that. Let me just make a few points and then I am going to give a little time to Senator Chambers. He had some more comments he