

comment with reference to something Senator Kristensen said about the unconstitutionality or lack of that being the case, or absence of that being the case, if this language is reinserted in this bill. The only reason you reinsert it is because it would have been repealed by LB 65 in its present form. That means that it would have been taken from the existing law, and I'm assuming that it was in the existing law as it is being reinstated now by Senator Withem's language. If this bill, as a result of a formal vote by the Legislature, reinstates the language, then that language will be associated with this bill. Let me ask Senator Kristensen a question, if I may.

SENATOR CROSBY: Senator Kristensen.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Kristensen, as I see the Withem amendment, it's talking about inserting some language and the language is underlined. Is that the way you read his amendment? Is that what we are dealing with?

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Let me look, just a second.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Each presidential elector should cast his or her ballot...

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Yes, I think it...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So, LB 65 will contain that, and it will be shown as new language.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: It will be shown as new language, but, Senator, it's the language that is in the existing statute today.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But the point that I'm getting to is that since it is new language, and it is being adopted in this bill, it would be implicated in any challenge made to the bill, would you agree to that?

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Well, no, I wouldn't agree with that,...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: ...but I suppose you could make that stre...I mean, could you...could you make that argument, yes, but I also, well, the analogy I'd use isn't appropriate.