

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Bromm. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Madam President, members of the Legislature, let me bring into focus for you, if I can, some of the problems that we're dealing with by adopting this language. The discussion so far has been in terms of an individual signing a petition. That's not where the real problem comes in. The problem comes when petition circulators try to put pressure on clerks and election commissioners to accept petitions as being valid, we're not talking about individual signatures. And they bring unconscionable pressure on these clerks and they say the law is not clear here. It could mean this, it could mean that, accept them and then let the Secretary of State do something about it. That's where the pressure is being brought to bear. When the petitions are first turned in and sometimes the circulators know there are problems and will call these to the attention of the election commissioner or the clerk, as the case may be, and try to explain it away and bring some pressure to bear to have those petitions accepted. What Senator Bromm is suggesting is something that he and I had discussed earlier, and that would be where the word "match" remains in the bill there is a definition given. But in my opinion the definition that we put in should not try to include everything. It should be done in conjunction with what the Secretary of State has the authority to do already. There is a specific provision of statute which allows the Secretary of State and with consultation with or from the Attorney General, although the Secretary of State doesn't have to do that, can construe the election laws. And the ruling made by the Secretary of State will stand and have the force of law until modified by a court, or obviously by the Legislature. Senator Vrtiska's comment about not being intellectual enough to understand what I said is not well taken. I acknowledge, when I'm trying to explain certain things, that perhaps the more I explain it the less clear it becomes. But on this one I'm going to give Senator Vrtiska an example that I think he will agree with. Senator Vrtiska, if I say we are going to compare animals with animals, that's very broad, that means we can compare a horse with a cow, we can compare a fish with a fowl. But if we say, no, we're going to narrow it and we're going to compare only aquatic animals, I say, well, would an amphibian fit in that? You say, no, only those that live in the water all the time. So I say, what about great big fish, like sturgeons, are they big fish? Well, a tuna or a...what are those little, bitty...or a...