

legislative aide would want to give it you and let you take a look at it while I'm speaking, I would certainly appreciate your opinion and would ask you to consider this. I stepped out before you were speaking and talked with Secretary of State Moore about the problem, and I agree with the rationale, as I said in my opening, that I'd like to see a uniform standard and I would prefer the Secretary of State adopt the rules and regulations and apply that standard. The amendment which I am going to propose to substitute for the one that we're speaking of would leave the language in Section 6 the same, with the exception of going to line 17 and striking the sentence that says, if they do not match, the signature and address shall be presumed invalid. Now that's where we've got perhaps the invalid presumption of invalidity and, instead of having those words, we would insert these words, "If they substantially match, the signature and address shall be presumed valid". Now that would leave the Secretary of State in place as the final decision maker. It does leave the other language worded the way it is and I guess I'm hopeful that it will solve the problem. I would like to propose to insert this language and as soon as I stop talking I'm going to go up and ask leave to insert this amendment as a substitution for the AM1636. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Thank you, Senator Bromm. Senator Maurstad.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate the changes that I believe that Senator Bromm is proposing because without them I would have to oppose the amendment and if I caught what he indicated, I think with them I'm closer to supporting the amendment. The one thing that I'm still a little concerned about and if Senator Bromm is done substituting, I'd like to ask him a question. If not, I'll ask...maybe I'll just ask Senator Chambers a question. He's...

SENATOR LINDSAY: Senator Chambers, would you respond.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: ...usually fairly conversant in issues such as this. Senator Chambers, in the Attorney General's Opinion, on page 1712 in the Legislative Journal, just to give you an idea where I'm looking at, give you half a second to find that, 1712, down below where it's discussing Section 6 and then the last sentence of that paragraph it says, under current law the signature and address are presumed to be valid if the election commissioner or county clerk has found the signer to be a