

SENATOR LINDSAY: Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you. Senator Bromm, are we going to get a copy of this latest amendment? I have not seen one I guess and for the time being I'm going to speak against the Bromm amendment now as substituted even though it is substantially better in compliance with the intent than the previous amendment was. But, Senator Bromm, I want to ask a quick question of you and I know I talked to you about it earlier. Assuming for a moment that this amendment is agreed to and it goes to the Secretary of State and they're looking at signatures, how do they do interpret what substantial compliance is? What tool do they use, what judgments do they make to determine substantial compliance and when you have different Secretary of States over the year, how do we know that the precedent set will not be continued whether then every time you have a new Secretary of State they look at substantial compliance differently? Could you take a minute or so and not much more than that, but if you need it maybe we can punch on again, but the answer to that question.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Senator Bromm.

SENATOR BROMM: From my brief discussion with the Secretary of State my understanding is there is a guideline that they look for guidance in interpretation of what that means and it's a publication or a circular referred to as Morris which I think Secretary of States around the country try to use to interpret when a signature should be considered to be matching or when it substantially complies and the Secretary of State is going to issue guidelines based on that and try to follow those and also encourage the county clerks to publicize those guidelines. That's my understanding, Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Senator Bromm, and I appreciate that. And I'm not going to be necessarily that concerned if the amendment passes. I still am going to rise in opposition to the amendment, simply for the following reason. I have not yet been convinced that the policy that we have before us in the Enrollment and Review copy is an invalid one. I mean, I think that which we have already before us, notwithstanding the Bromm amendment, that which we already have I think is a legitimate bill and the only reason we're making the amendments is simply because of the Attorney General's Opinion and my sense