

February 1, 1996 LB 964

you will, on the electorate. There is opportunity for people not to have studied their lesson, so to speak, on the issues and simply take others. I can easily see having election parties ten days ahead of time whereby your entrance to that party could simply bring your ballot, and come together and we'll mark our ballot together and we will determine the issues, it might be a slate of issues. I am concerned that it could turn into a slate of candidates some day. It isn't in the works at this point, I understand that, but it could. And I would be adamantly opposed to going to slates in candidacy. And so, as I said, if there was a way to narrow the window here, I would be open to that. But the way it's written today, I cannot support advancing this issue, and so I will be supporting to IPP.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Thank you, Senator Wehrbein. Next is Senator Lynch, followed by Senator Maurstad, Senator Warner, Senator Jones, Senator Schimek, Senator Bernard-Stevens, Senator Chambers, and Senator Cudaback. Senator Lynch.

SENATOR LYNCH: Mr. Acting Speaker and members. I just learned a new word, chicanery, from my good friend, Senator Wehrbein. You know there has been chicanery in laws that provide for the right of people to vote. There used to be the poll tax that we used to know. You had to pass a test. Senator Wehrbein mentioned that people should study the issues and they should vote, it's a worthy goal. Hopefully people would understand what they're voting for. But we all know that doesn't happen, especially where they have these machines where you can punch in one color for Republicans, and one color for Democrats, and yes on all the propositions, just pull the arm down. At least in our state we have a ballot where you have to at least look it over and make separate X's. I never supported voting machines because of the chicanery that could go on and the unintelligent voting. But it's important for us to know that chicanery could also be again because we don't want people to vote certain ways, that we simply deny their right. That's chicanery as far as I'm concerned, in the finest sense of the word. I do not support the indefinite postponement of this. In fact, I don't think it includes enough. It ought to include everybody, including individuals in this bill. But we know that would never pass. We ought to make it possible for everybody to vote. I thought, in fact what David Bernard-Stevens said when he finished, about using machines, and to tell you the truth when he got finished I think I support that, if it would in fact cut down on all the