

simply does away with the necessity to present evidence to reach a certain threshold.

SENATOR BROMM: Okay.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So if the bill in its final form allows the county clerk or the election commissioner to take evidence, as you're mentioning, that could be done. But with the language that exists in the bill right now I'm not certain. My insertion of the word "only" does not bear on that at all, either the content of the presumption, nor what the word "match" would mean in terms of the other things you discuss. My use of this word does not go to any of those matters at all. Mine deals only with the presumption. So if you're going to allow the validity of the signature and the address to be established...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...by evidence to show that even though they're not the same, the signature on the petition...I meant the address, because if the signature is not the same obviously we're talking about two different people, evidence could be used to show that validity is there, if that's allowed under the law. My insertion of the word "only" won't either make that the law or take it out of the law...

SENATOR BROMM: No.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...if it's already there.

SENATOR BROMM: I agree with that. I think the insertion of the word "only" simply limits very clearly when the presumption arises at the county clerk or election commissioner level, and for purposes of clarity I support that. I want to continue to pursue this a little bit to determine whether under this law we can have any extrinsic evidence introduced to the county clerk, or whether that can only be presented to the Secretary of State if they don't identically match. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Bromm. Is there any further discussion on the Chambers amendment? Seeing none, Senator Chambers waives closing. The question before you is the adoption of the Chambers amendment to LB 337. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Please record.