

inserting the words "for purposes of this section, match shall mean substantially the same and does not require the signatures and addresses to be exact counterparts." It removes the perception or the possible literal interpretation that they have to be exact counterparts. I don't want to loosen up the language to the extent that it doesn't require these people to do substantially the same thing in signing their name or have substantially the same addresses. And the Secretary of State will issue instructions as to what his interpretation is, substantially the same, just as he would have apparently if we just left the word "match" in there. But I submit to you that Webster says match means equal. It means an exact, an exact counterpart. If we don't adopt my amendment and we leave the language as it is, we are making it more difficult to sign a petition than to vote. We're making it more difficult to sign a petition than it is to go to the poll and vote. Does that make sense? To me, it does not. To me, voting is absolutely the most precise, important right that we have in the democracy and that should be the standard that is the highest, but in this case we're going to say that we're going to establish a higher standard for signing a petition than for you to go to the poll and vote with regard to the exactness of your signature and address. Now, having said that, I think that, you know, I don't think that the intent of the body...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR BROMM: ...is to require an absurd result when you sign a petition. I do not believe that's our intent. I think that...I need to submit to you that I believe the Secretary of State will be able to promulgate uniform standards for the clerks to follow. He will be able to use some common sense with his examples that he provides to those folks. I don't want to put a whole laundry list of examples in this bill. I want to have the concept that we're going to prevent fraud, deception and misrepresentation by tightening up the language substantially from what it was before. Just remember, before all they had to do was find they were a registered voter. We didn't really have language that said that signatures had to be substantially the same or the addresses had to be substantially the same. We didn't have that in the law. We will have that in the law. That's a significant departure and a significant tightening but I don't think it will result in an absurd...absurd finding or absurd examples across the state of signatures being thrown out for no good reason. So, with that,