

ever talked to me about them. Nobody ever told me they had a problem with this bill and if we go through all of them that will be four motions to return to Select File, discussion of four amendments, four motions to advance to E & R final and you know, we discussed, we have discussed all of these areas before. We discussed the 30-day requirement on both General and Select stages of debate. We talked about the match on Select File and arrived at some compromise language with the Bromm-Schimek amendment. We've discussed forms and I think that this is simply an attempt to harass this bill. I'd be willing to listen to Senator Witek, but I think that this could have all been put in one amendment, for one thing, to save all of those motions back and forth. I object. I would be happy to talk about the individual amendments if the time comes to return these bills to Select File but I would encourage you to vote against this motion and to proceed with Final Reading. And, Senator Kristensen, would you possibly like any of my time or not?

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Kristensen, two and a half minutes.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Thank you, Madam President, members of the Legislature, and I guess I'm not going to speak about the process that's gone through. What I'm more concerned about I guess is the terms here of the first amendment and, Senator Witek, if I'm looking at the right amendment, if I'm not, stand up and wave at me and tell me to change course, but if we're looking at the amendment that adds the language "substantially compares with", so often in bills like this you look for terms of art and in the law there's not really the words, "substantially compares with" really doesn't have any basis. Things like substantial compliance do. And if that's what you're looking at, the concept and some of the members that were around for the Dennis Byars, I see Senator Hall there obviously remembers the concept of substantial compliance very well. And when you deal with election issues the issue may well, you have a standard set in law but there is the concept and the legal theory of substantial compliance with that word "match". And so I think that the words substantial compliance is incumbent upon that and when they go to interpret those laws obviously they're going to strictly construe the right to vote but in terms of petitions and terms of other things in comparing those languages, the concept of substantial compliance would well come in and that the term "substantially compares with" I'm just unclear that it has any legal basis with it. I don't think it means anything and I guess would look for some explanation of