

ballot if they so desire. I guess the arguments pro and con would be the following. Arguments pro, agreeing to this particular amendment, would be that those people who had already gone through an election process could be...very arguably so, they have already had their petition signed. They've had thousands of people vote for them one way or another which is far above the minimum that we need to...they would need to have for the petition process. It could also be argued that those with the name recognition that had gone through the primary would have no difficulty whatsoever about going to two or three church functions or whatever, one county fair, and giving the petitions that they need, it would be one added thing that they would have to do. Since they have already gone through the election process, they have, in essence, had their petitions signed by people who voted for them and it is on the record, it could be argued that they...since they have a certificate of election, we have not taken that away, that they are entitled to be on that ballot. This amendment, if it would be agreed to, would simply say that in districts where they have already had a primary those winners would be on the election in the November ballot, would not have to petition on, but it would allow a process for any new people in the district to petition on as to the process under LB 9. A vote against the measure would simply say that, no, even though you have an election certificate, you are not automatically on the ballot, you do have to go back and go through that petition process. And it could be, for some reason or another, that someone with a certificate of election for some reason may not know the deadline, may have a mix-up somewhere and may actually fail to get the number of signatures necessary, yet they won a primary. That could be certainly a problem at least in regards to the fairness. This is simply a policy discussion. I think the body needs to vote one way or another so whichever way we go we can at least say we had discussion on it and this is why we chose to do it in this manner. This amendment brings that to the forefront so the body can make a decision.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Bernard-Stevens. Discussion on the Bernard-Stevens...on the motion to return actually. Senator Lynch, d d you wish to discuss the motion to return? Senator Crosby.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just have two questions, Senator Bernard-Stevens, you have confused me. I just have two questions.