

amount of fraud is actually lessened in a mail-in ballot situation because you have to check the signatures of voters, and it's a more secure situation. You also get people who are properly registered in the mail-in ballot situation. If you're talking about, as I think Senator Bohlke was alluding to, that we might get that revenue bill out and get it on the ballot and it will be, it wouldn't be on a special election ballot, it'd be on a general election ballot, Senator Bohlke, because you couldn't leave it up to each subdivision I don't think statewide to decide when they were going to have those particular elections. It would all have to be at the same time and, therefore, I think it would have to be on the general election ballot during a state election so that doesn't concern me. I just ask you to please defeat the Bernard-Stevens amendment, give each county the right to decide for itself. We know that it saves money. We know that there's never been evidence of fraud. We know there are safeguards put into the system and, yes, Senator Witek, with one exception I'm going to be supporting your amendment regarding those fraud prohibiting amendments that you have offered. So I, too, I, too, am really cautious when it comes to the ballot. I think it's sacred and I think we need to put everything in place to prevent fraud. But I don't believe this situation will engender fraud and I believe, in fact, that it will be beneficial to a lot of local subdivisions. Thank you.

**SPEAKER WITHEM:** Thank you, Senator Schimek. Senator Chambers followed by Senators Cudaback, Robinson, Bohlke and Bernard-Stevens.

**SENATOR CHAMBERS:** Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, I'm opposed to Senator Bernard-Stevens' amendment. Senator Bernard-Stevens, sometimes a comparison can be made between a larger political subdivision and a smaller one. In other instances, that is not possible. Based on what might happen in a village, a person cannot automatically extrapolate from that and determine what would happen in a metropolitan area. If Senator Bernard-Stevens and others have doubt about the bill's policy aspects, that's one thing. But to suggest that we have to wait and see what a village might do in order to determine what may happen in a populous county or city is not really logical. I think Senator Schimek's amendment is a valid one. We did discuss it when we adopted it, and I believe that the points made that led to adoption of her amendment were good