

Conway, would you yield to a couple of questions for me, I guess, more just to get things on the record.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Senator Conway.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Jerry, on the bill as it is now, would it be fair to say that the language that we have clearly is not specific in regards to what a vacancy is and whether the certificate of election holders should or should not be on, but it is the intent of the body through discussions and through debate on the floor, as what-have-you, that that is what we would want it to be? Would that be a fair statement?

SENATOR CONWAY: The statement that that is our intent would be a fair statement.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Do you know, in your experience in the Legislature, and you have had far more than I, and I ask this truly because I don't know, on legislation that is vague, and maybe I should be asking Senator Lindsay or Senator Kristensen, on legislation that is vague, on the interpretation, has the court traditionally in the past gone to the record in order to find what the intent was and, consequently, that is what ended up being the rulings or that is how things went after that point?

SENATOR CONWAY: That is strictly the case, and the current court has even gone to statements made, as you well know, in committee searching out that intent as well. So, yes, they do go to that, the intent language of the discussion on the floor.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Okay. Senator Lindsay, would you yield to a question?

PRESIDENT MOUL: Senator Lindsay.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Senator Lindsay, the question I had, I guess, is kind of the same question I had for Senator Conway. If, in fact, we have language that is not clear on the certificate of election, and if that would become a problem, do you feel that if...that we have adequate comments within the record as to what the intent of the Legislature wanted, therefore, it, in the long run, will not be a problem in the future. And, again, I just do not...I truly want to know, I do not know.