

February 19, 1991

they're going to conduct their elections. With that, I will turn my time over to Senator Ashford and he can use the remainder of it. Thank you.

SENATOR WARNER PRESIDING

SENATOR WARNER: Senator Ashford, you have about two and a half minutes.

SENATOR ASHFORD: Thank you. This is mainly for the record, Mr. President, and members. A lot has been talked about today about the prior cases in the District Courts involving the Gage County cases and other precedents. I would like to first address, very quickly, the cases that...the District Court cases involving the Byars-Korslund case. First of all, Judge McGinn took this case on a mandamus claim, not on an election contest petition, therefore the issue of substantial compliance was not argued before Judge McGinn. Also, Judge Finn, who heard the other Gage County case, cited the case of Mommsen v. School District 25, which is the case that Senator Landis alluded to. I think it's very important, Mommsen is one of the most recent election contest cases. And in that case, Senator Landis, there was a cite to the Rasp case which we have talked about and, Senator Landis...and it's easy to make this error, but with citing the Rasp case, rather than the Mommsen case. In the Mommsen case, the issue was the same issue as in this case that, in fact, there were...there were absentee ballots that were not...that were counted...were not counted. The issue though succinctly was in the Mommsen case...and why the Supreme Court found that those absentee ballots could not be counted was because...

SENATOR WARNER: One minute, Senator Ashford.

SENATOR ASHFORD: ...was because there was no endorsement whatsoever on those ballots, no signature whatsoever, and what the court said as follows: Citing the case of Master v. Wilkinson, which is another case involving ballot questions, the blank being filled in with the written name was substantial compliance and that's the case relied upon by the contestants of that particular election. But then the court said as follows in regards to Mommsen: In the present case, there was no endorsement whatever and hence no compliance whatsoever. And Mommsen is one of the most recent cases that has come down from the Supreme Court. The standard of law is not just a statute,