

of intent, we haven't learned much lesson. I am specifically talking about pages 8 and 9 of LB 9. And, again, as I am sitting here discussing it, I am also in my mind trying to think of the proper amendment and, hopefully, if there is at least some discussion on the bill, I will be able to draft an amendment quickly. And, if not, I will just fly with what I think will be correct. The way that the bill now reads, if it passes, when it passes, because LB 9 does need to pass now with the advancement and passage of LB 7E. The way it stands now, the bill, is that we have a definition on 8 and 9 of what is a vacancy. And a vacancy, we added a new category of vacancy, when a vacancy appears on the ballot, and we are specifically talking now about District 17 because that will be the district affected now by the change in LB 7E. In District 17, there was a primary that has not been dissolved. We have not stated anywhere that that was an invalid primary. In fact, the evidence shows that there has been very little change in the number of people in District 17, 4.76 percent of the total population changed. That is all. The total population, 75-some percent have remained in that district. So it was a valid primary election. We have two certificate of election holders that say on their certificate they will be on the general ballot. They will be on the general ballot. The intent of the body last week, and as of this moment, at least, the perception of the body was that LB 9 would mean that all...there would be no one on the ballot but all candidates, no matter if they were in the primary or not, would have to run or file petitions to be on the ballot. My argument is on top of page 9, simply, if you haven't read it, look at it. We have added a new section that defines vacancy. And the section says the following: The boundaries of...there shall be a vacancy if the boundaries of a legislative district are changed by the Legislature between the primary and general election. What that means in strict terms, in my judgment is the following, that we have put a new category on vacancy. The other categories of if a candidate could not continue in the ballot process, and so they have died, or they were ill, or they had to withdraw, whatever the case may be, they moved and no longer were there, then there was a vacancy of which there really was a spot left on the ballot and we could petition people on to do that. But what we have done now, by the adding of the section that is there, what we have done by the exact wording, we have simply said that when you change a district, as we have just done on LB 7E, which is fine, but when you changed that district, there will then be a vacancy. What that implies is, in my judgment, is that both candidates that