DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment goes to the heart of the issue that our disabled voters currently face and is in keeping with the amendment that was introduced by Senator Patrick a moment ago. It actually reflects part of the recommendation from the Carter-Baker Report to make it easier for those in our disabled community to absentee vote. What it would allow is the creation of an opportunity for a disabled voter to receive a permanent absentee vote status unless and until they ask that that be removed. It would allow the disabled voter to apply at the time that they register to vote, or at a polling place on election day, or during early voting and then it would become activated on the first election after the application is submitted. I move adoption of Floor Amendment Number 36.

PRESIDENT: Thank you, Senator Davis. The Chair recognizes Senator Fraser on Floor Amendment 36.

FRASER: Senator, we appreciate you bringing this forward. This issue was just taken care of in the, the amendment that Senator Patrick did, and I would move to table this Amendment Number 36.

PRESIDENT: Chair recognizes Senator Davis on Floor Amendment 36—

DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. President. This actually isn't at all taken care of by Senator Patrick's amendment. Senator Patrick's amendment simply removes the requirement that a disabled voter would have to show a picture ID when they go in person to vote. What this amendment does instead, is allows a permanent absentee vote status for a disabled voter who requests that status. In fact, it, it's the opposite of Senator Patrick's in the sense that it's looking at the absentee vote opportunity for the disabled voter, not the in-person voting opportunity for the disabled voter. And I would move that we vote no on the table to Floor Amendment Number 36.

PRESIDENT: Thank you, Senator Davis. Members, the issue before us is the motion to table by Senator Fraser, opposed by Senator Davis. The Secretary will call roll.


PRESIDENT: (Gavel) There being 19 ayes and 11 nays, the motion to table prevails. (Gavel) The Chair lays out the following floor amendment, Floor Amendment Number 37 by Senator Davis. The Secretary will--will read the amendment.

SECRETARY: Floor Amendment Number 37 by
Davis, amending Senate Bill 14 by adding the appropriate, following appropriately numbered section to the bill, which is adding Section 31.015, uniform statewide voter registration system.

PRESIDENT: Senator Zaffirini, do you wish to speak?

ZAFFIRINI: I had pressed my button to get, to ask permission to ask a point of information.

PRESIDENT: Yo--You're recognized.

ZAFFIRINI: Could you tell us, Mr. President, how many more amendments are, will be before us?

PRESIDENT: Yes, we are on, this amendment is Amendment Number 37. We have, we have three more and then we've had three or four amendments that were pulled, temporarily, and so wh--we're gonna have to go back to the author and see if they want to bring them back up.

ZAFFIRINI: 'Kay. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT: Thank you, Ma'am. The Chair recognizes Senator Davis on Floor Amendment 37.

DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. President. Floor Amendment 37 seeks to implement another recommendation from the Carter-Baker Report, which is to have a statewide voter registration system that would include the following, expanded voter registration outreach. It would establish more registration offices, especially where distance between offices is determined to be prohibited. It would provide for outreach to inform voting age population of registration status, registration location, and locations of precinct polling places. Voters would be able to verify and correct registration information 30 days prior to elections. Voter assistance hotlines and Web sites, which are active 30 days prior to elections, would be created to answer questions. And, it would establish an ombudsman at the state level to address cases of voter suppression, voter discrimination, or other abuse against voters. In the face of a more limiting opportunity for voting in the State of Texas, as is presented by Senate Bill 14, I feel it's important that we enhance and protect the rights of those who currently have the right to vote, to the extent possible, and this amendment seeks to do that. I would move adoption of Floor Amendment Number 37.

PRESIDENT: Thank you, Senator Davis. The Chair recognizes Senator Fraser on Floor Amendment 37.

FRASER: Members, the Senate Bill 14 is a, a voter identification, photo ID bill, this bill deals with registration. This is not the appropriate p--forum to bring this issue forward. I move to table Amendment 37.

PRESIDENT: (Pause) Chair recognizes Senator Davis, excuse me for the, the delay--DAVIS: Certainly.
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(Inaudible, background conversation)

PRESIDENT --recognizes Senator Davis to close.

DAVIS Thankyou, Mr. President. Again, as I stated, I believe that Senate Bill 14, that we are voting on today, serves to, very likely, limit or decrease the, the opportunity for legal voting citizens in the State of Texas to exercise their right to vote. I feel it's important that if a bill like that is to pass we do everything we can to enhance that right to the extent possible, which is what this amendment seeks to do. I would therefore ask that we respectfully vote no on the motion to table Floor Amendment Number 37.

PRESIDENT Thank you, Senator Davis. Members, the issue is the motion by Senator Fraser to table Floor Amendment 37, Senator Davis opposes. The Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY Birdwell, Carona, Davis, Deuell, Duncan, Ellis, Eltife, Estes, Fraser, Gallegos, Harris, Hegar, Hinojosa, Huffman, Jackson, Lucio, Nelson, Nichols, Ogden, Patrick, Rodriguez, Seliger, Shapiro, Van de Putte, Watson, Wentworth, West, Whitmire, Williams and Zaffirini.

PRESIDENT (Gavel) There being 19 ayes and 11 nays, the motion to table prevails. (Gavel)

PRESIDENT : The Chair lays out the following floor amendment, Floor Amendment Number 38 by Senator Davis. The Secretary will read the amendment.

SECRETARY : Floor Amendment Number 38 by Davis, amending Senate Bill 14 by adding an appropriately numbered section.

PRESIDENT : The Chair recognizes Senator Davis to explain Floor Amendment 38.

DAVIS : Thank you, Mr. President. Currently, when voters are notified that they've been removed from the voter registry for particular purposes, the reasons that trigger that notification are fairly limited. This amendment would seek to expand the purposes for which notification is provided. One, in the death of a voter because, actually, sometimes a person is removed from a voter list based on the belief that they've died when they actually have not. The other would be notice that the residence is outside the country which could possibly be incorrect. The other would be where a voter has applied to vote in another county, or state, which again is possibly incorrect. And then, finally, a notice of cancellation due to a voter's name appearing on a voter suspense list which could be incorrect. This simply seeks to assure that when a voter is removed from the voter registry, it is being done for proper purposes, and provides as much an opportunity to cure a defect that might've been created in the removal from the voter registry as possible. I would move adoption of Floor Amendment 38.
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PRESIDENT : Thank you, Senator Davis. The Chair recognizes Senator Fraser on Floor Amendment 38.
FRASER : As in the last issue, Senate Bill 14's relating to the requirements to vote. This bill deals with the register--voter's registration. This is not the appropriate forum. I would now move to table Amendment 38.

PRESIDENT : Senator Fraser moves to table. The Chair recognizes Senator Davis to close.
DAVIS : Thank you, Mr. President. I would again simply say that it is my strong belief that the Senate bill that we are voting on today would serve to limit the number of voters who are legally registered and voting today. And I'm simply trying to create corresponding opportunities to enhance the protection of legal voting rights in the State of Texas to the extent possible, simultaneously as we take up this issue. I would respectfully ask that we vote no on the motion to table Floor Amendment Number 38.

PRESIDENT : Thank you, Senator Davis. Members, the issue is the motion to table by Senator Fraser, opposed by Senator Davis. The Secretary will call the roll.

PRESIDENT : (Gavel) There being 19 ayes and 11 nays, the motion to table prevails. (Gavel) The following floor amendment, (inaudible)--

PRESIDENT : Thank you, Senator Davis. Members, the issue is the motion to table by Senator Fraser, opposed by Senator Davis. The, the Secretary will call the roll.


PRESIDENT : (Gavel) There being 19 ayes and 11 nays, the motion to table prevails. (Gavel) The following floor amendment, (inaudible)--

SECRETARY : Floor Amendment Number 39 by Davis, amending Senate Bill 14 in Section 7 of the Bill.

PRESIDENT : The Chair recognizes Senator Davis to explain Floor Amendment 39.
DAVIS : Thank you, Mr. President. Floor Amendment Number, is this Number 40, 39?

PRESIDENT : (Inaudible)--
DAVIS : Floor Amendment Number 39 seeks to address a concern with regard to indigent voters who may not be able to
obtain proof of identification because they cannot afford the fees that would provide them with that identification. What this amendment would allow would be for the indigent voter to fill out a provisional ballot. If a voter is accepted for a provisional ballot, under this amendment, they would, not later than the sixth day after the date of the election present proof of their identification to the voter registrar, for examination by the early voting ballot board, or execute an affidavit before the voter registrar, affirming under penalty of perjury, that the voter is indigent. It provides that the description of indigency would follow the Government Code in the State of Texas, which states that an indigent person means an individual who earns not more than 125 percent of the income standard established by applicable federal poverty guidelines. This amendment mirrors the Indiana indigency provision, in the Indiana voting law, which allows for an indigent person to be relieved from the cost of providing identification in order to vote. I would respectfully move adoption of Floor Amendment Number 39.

PRESIDENT : Thank you, Senator Davis. The Chair recognizes, Senator Duncan, for, for, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?

DUNCAN : A question of the author of the amendment.

PRESIDENT : Will Senator Davis yield?

DAVIS : Yes.

DUNCAN : Thank you. Senator Davis, I saw your amendment earlier on and had been working on an idea to deal with the issue of someone who is indigent and who may not be able to afford or pay the fee to get the birth certificate. I think we heard some testimony on that last night. So, I've come up with an idea. Let me ask you a couple questions on yours though. As I understand yours, the person would be eligible to vote without a provisional ballot, it would just be if they executed an affidavit that they were indigent at the voting place, then they would be able to go ahead and vote just a regular ballot. Is that correct?

DAVIS : Actually, I don't believe that is correct, Senator Duncan. It provides that a person who is indigent and who is unable to obtain proof of ID, without the payment of a fee, shall be provided a provisional ballot as provided under Section 63.011. So, they actually would be required to vote provisionally.

DUNCAN : Well, I didn't read it that way and so I came up with an alternative version and I'd like for you, if you wouldn't mind pullin' this one down--

DAVIS : Of course.

DUNCAN : --let's look at it and see if, if it works.

DAVIS : I'd be happy to do that.

DUNCAN : (Inaudible, overlapping conversation)

thank you.

DAVIS : Thank you, Senator Duncan.

PRESIDENT : Senator Lucio, did you wish to speak
on this?

LUCIO : No, thank you, Mr. President. I think she's gonna pull it down and I'll, I'll ask some questions a little later. Thank you.

PRESIDENT : All right, Senator Davis temporarily pulls down, n--are you pulling down?

DAVIS : Yes.

PRESIDENT : Pulls down Floor Amendment Number 39.

END OF SECTION II
PRESIDENT: The following floor amendment—the following floor amendment, Floor Amendment Number 40 by Senator Duncan, Ogden and Patrick, the Secretary will read the amendment.

SECRETARY: Floor Amendment Number 40 by Duncan, Ogden and Patrick, (it's) being passed out.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Duncan on Floor Amendment For--

DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr. President and Members. F--Floor Amendment Number 40 is a modification of Senator Davis' amendment, and I think it makes it clear that if a person is an indigent person as defined in state law in the government code, then that person then would be able to cast a provisional ballot. And like the bill as stated, for a person who does not have identification can then return to the registrar and execute an affidavit, under the penalty of perjury, if the person is indigent, or has a religious objection to being photographed. (And) that's very similar to, if not identical to, the provisions in the Indiana law. And it would be a fail-safe provision for those persons, and I think this language makes that very clear. And I know we heard some testimony yesterday with regard to those concerns and issues. And, so, we believe this would be an appropriate provision to put in the bill to accommodate that concern.

PRESIDENT: Senator Davis, for what purpose?

DAVIS: (Pause)

PRESIDENT: (Inaudible, background conversation)

DAVIS: (Thank you.)

DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr. President and Members. F--Floor Amendment Number 40 is a modification of Senator Davis' amendment, and I think it makes it clear that if a person is an indigent person as defined in state law in the government code, then that person then would be able to cast a provisional ballot. And like the bill as stated, for a person who does not have identification can then return to the registrar and execute an affidavit, under the penalty of perjury, if the person is indigent, or has a religious objection to being photographed. (And) that's very similar to, if not identical to, the provisions in the Indiana law. And it would be a fail-safe provision for those persons, and I think this language makes that very clear. And I know we heard some testimony yesterday with regard to those concerns and issues. And, so, we believe this would be an appropriate provision to put in the bill to accommodate that concern.

PRESIDENT: Senator Davis, for what purpose?

DAVIS: To make a, a comment to the author of the amendment.

PRESIDENT: Will, will Senator Duncan yield?

DUNCAN: I'll yield.

DAVIS: Thank you, Senator Duncan. I've read your amendment and I certainly have no pride of authorship on this issue. I think your amendment actually does do a better job of spelling out how we create this protection. It does it not only for an indigent voter but also for someone who has a religious objection to being photographed. I support your amendment wholeheartedly and will pull mine down and give you my vote and support of your amendment. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Fraser on Floor Amend--Floor Amendment Number 40.

FRASER: I, I would declare this is good work on th--on the Senators. They've, it's an issue we actually have been talkin' about all day of how to, to solve it. Senator Duncan, I appreciate you working on it, and I think there were, there are a coupla other Senators involved, but this is
very acceptable, and, to the author.

PRESIDENT: Members, the issue is on the adoption of Floor Amendment Number 40.

DUNCAN: (Fo--Fo)--Mr. Chair--

PRESIDENT: (Inaudible, overlapping conversation)--Mr. President, before we do that could we add Senator Davis' name to the amendment?

DUNCAN: She said yes.

PRESIDENT: 'kay.

PRESIDENT: (Inaudible, background conversation)

Amendment Number 40 by Senator Duncan, which is supported by--

PRESIDENT: --Senator Fraser. The Secretary will call the roll.


SECRETARY: Jackson.

PRESIDENT: There being 30 ayes and no nays, Floor Amendment Number 40 is adopted. (Gavel)

SECRETARY: (Inaudible, background conversation)

PRESIDENT: Davis.

PRESIDENT: (No.)

PRESIDENT: Would Senator Davis and Senator Fraser come forward, with, we--we have some--

PRESIDENT: --some--

PRESIDENT: --amendments that have been pulled, and I wanna see what the status on that is.

PRESIDENT: (Long pause)

PRESIDENT: (Inaudible, background conversation)

PRESIDENT: Oh.

PRESIDENT: (Inaudible, background conversation)

PRESIDENT: (Inaudible, not speaking into the microphone) (yes)--

PRESIDENT: (Long pause)

PRESIDENT: Uh-huh.

PRESIDENT: (Inaudible, background conversation)

PRESIDENT: (Laughter)
conversation) --

speak into the microphone) --

(Duncan) --

(President) --

Secretary (Davis, amending Section 7 of the bill) --

President (The Chair recognizes Senator Davis to explain Floor Amendment 11) --

Davis (Thank you, Mr. President. As described earlier in the afternoon, this is the amendment that seeks to provide an opportunity for a woman whose name has changed through marriage or divorce, either to correct that information by presenting a marriage license or a divorce decree to the election representative, or by executing an affidavit stating that her name is the...
name on the precinct list of registered voters, but has been changed due to marriage or divorce, so does not match that name that's listed on her state issued ID card. I have worked with Senator Fraser on the amendment. Senator Fraser has requested that I remove the affidavit portion, which would take away the woman's opportunity to provide an affidavit swearing under penalty of perjury that her name changed because of marriage or divorce, and, instead, leaves her only with the opportunity to vote if she's able to present a marriage license or a divorce decree. My concern about striking the affidavit language is that we actually will be creating a more burdensome situation (than) currently exist under the law today. As the Secretary of State's office testified yesterday, at least right now, there's discretion in the offices of our, our county registrars, in terms of how they deal with the situation. And certainly, it's the case that today, in many precincts, women are able to go in and clarify that the change in their name has occurred through marriage or divorce, and, and that is acceptable to the, the precinct election officer. If we take the affidavit language out of this amendment, I'm afraid that we're actually creating a greater burden than exists today, because it would take away that discretion and actually provide that it would only be allowed where a marriage license or a divorce decree could be provided. And, I--I-I can't accept the amendment to my amendment that Senator Fraser was proposing. So, I would continue to ask for support of Floor Amendment Number 11 in its current form.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Fraser on Floor Amendment 11.

FRASER: Members, Senator Davis has actually outlined it e--pretty much, exactly the way this is played out. We, we've been working for the last hour and a half trying to find a way that this amendment would work. The first two sections she's amending, which is (i), and then the Number 1, we're comfortable with and be willing to take. And we ask her if she'd take Number 2 out, that, it would be acceptable, and I'd be glad to take the amendment. I think Senator Davis believes, her interpretation is, if you take out 2, it would possibly change it and, and, and not make it better than current law. We disagree, or I disagree, that that is the case. And, we, we tried hard on this one, we, we tried to get it through, but I, I don't think we're gonna get there. And, I, I'm, Senator, I think I'm gonna have to move to table Amendment Number 11.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Davis to close.

DAVIS: (Inaudible, background conversation) Thank you, Mr. President. Again, I would just urge that where a woman is willing to sign a sworn affidavit under penalty of perjury, that the reason that her ID last name does not match the last name on the registrar's list is because she has married or divorced, should be sufficient for us to be able to, to trust that, that that's a valid voter standing in front of a registrar asking f--to exercise their right to vote. And,
as a consequence, I would respectfully ask that we vote no on the motion to table Floor Amendment Number 11.

PRESIDENT : Thank you, Senator Davis. Members, you've heard the motion by Senator Fraser to table. Senator Davis opposes. The Secretary will call the roll.


PRESIDENT : (Gavel) There being 18 ayes and 12 nays, the motion to table prevails. (Gavel) Also, temporarily withdrawn, the Chair lays out Floor Amendment Number 15--

PRESIDENT : (Inaudible, background conversation) --also by Senator Davis. The Secretary will read the amendment.

SECRETARY : Floor Amendment Number 15 by Davis, amending Senate Bill 14 by striking Section 12 of the bill and substituting a new Section 12.

PRESIDENT : The Chair recognizes Senator Davis on Floor Amendment 15.

DAVIS : Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment, as I said earlier, seeks to mirror the allowance for expired IDs as it exists in the Indiana law that was approved by the Supreme Court--

DAVIS : (Inaudible, background conversation) --in 2008. What it would allow would be for a Texan to use an expired government issued photo ID only if the photo ID expired after the last general election. What it seeks to allow is for a person to have been put on notice when they've gone to vote that their state issued government ID has expired, give them a grace period to the next election to correct that, and be able to use it in the future. It would expand the period of time that an expired government ID could be used from that amendment that was accepted, that Senator Lucio presented earlier in the evening, which was a 60-day grace period to a grace period between general elections, essentially, which could be up to a 2-year period of time. Again, it does mirror that, that language in the Indiana law, and I would move approval of Floor Amendment Number 15.

PRESIDENT : (Hum.) The Chair recognizes Senator Fraser on Floor Amendment 15.

FRASER : Again, Senator Davis' explanation is correct. This was the one we talked about earlier. Since then, I accepted (sic) amendment by Senator Lucio. Senator Lucio offered up an amendment that if someone's driver's license expired we would have a grace period of two months. So, if it had been expired two months, they still would
be eligible to vote. This amendment is attempting to expand that where it could be up to two years, and we think the amendment accepted from Senator Lucio is sufficient. I would move to table Amendment 15.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Davis.

DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: --to close.

DAVIS: For the reason stated previously, I would respectfully ask that we vote against the motion to table Floor Amendment Number 15.

PRESIDENT: Thank you, Senator Davis. Members, the issue is a motion by Senator Fraser to table, opposed by Senator Davis. The Secretary will call the roll.


PRESIDENT: (Gavel) There being 19 ayes and 11 nays, the motion to table prevails. (Gavel)

PRESIDENT: Senator Davis withdraws Floor Amendment Number 6, replaces it with Floor Amendment Number 41--

DAVIS: Yes, Sir.

PRESIDENT: --which, which we're handing out as we speak. The Chair lays out Floor Amendment Number 41 by Senator Davis. The Secretary will read the amendment.

SECRETARY: Floor Amendment Number 41 by Davis.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Davis to explain Floor Amendment 41.

DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. President. This reflects a slight change to what was presented earlier as Floor Amendment Number 6. After working with Senator Fraser and his staff, I do believe that the inclusion of the language, as you see handwritten into this Floor amendment, does improve upon the intent of the amendment, which is to create an opportunity for an election officer to allow a voter to vote where the name on the documentation doesn't exactly match that that's on the list of the registered voters, but is substantially similar. And where the voter submits an affidavit stating that he, he or she, is the person on that list of registered voters. I appreciate Senator Fraser working with me on making the improvement to this amendment, and with that, I would ask for adoption of Floor Amendment Number 41, excuse me.

(Inaudible, background conversation)
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PRESIDENT : (Good.)

FRASER : The Chair recognizes Senator Fraser.

FRASER : And, Members, I'm, I'm thinking this
is the last amendment. So, this is, would be a, a good way to end the evening
is that Senator Davis very gracefully worked with us. We had us a lus--ush--
just a small discomfort in this and we asked her to insert this language just
to clarify the intent. She agreed, and I think it improves the quality of the
amendment, this is acceptable.

PRESIDENT : Members, the issue before us is the
adoption of Floor Amendment Number 41 by Senator Davis, which is
supported by Senator Fraser. The Secretary will call the roll.


SECRETARY : Harris.

PRESIDENT : There being 30 ayes and no nays,

DAVIS : Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT : Need a motion.

PRESIDENT : -y-yeah, (wanna) stand at ease?

PRESIDENT : I'm gonna suggest we stand at ease

PRESIDENT : Fifteen, twenty minutes.

PRESIDENT : --we'll stand at ease until 7:45, which

AT EASE

(Gavel)

(Gavel)

(Gavel)

(Gavel)
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Aw, that's (bad).

(Inaudible, background conversation)

(Hey) I don't think you've talked to

(inaudible). They did a great job.

SESSION RESUMES

PRESIDENT: (Gavel) Members, the Senate will

come to order. The Senate will come to order. The Chair recognizes Senator

Fraser.

FRASER: Mr. President, I would now move

passage of Senate Bill 14 to engrossment.

PRESIDENT: Members, Senator Fraser moves the

passage to engrossment of Senate Bill 14. The Secretary will call roll.

PRESIDENT: (Inaudible) a second.

PRESIDENT: Excuse me. I didn't see. Senator Van
de Putte. For what purpose (Ma'am)?

VAN DE PUTTE: To speak against the bill.

PRESIDENT: You're recognized.

VAN DE PUTTE: Thank you, Mr. President. Mr.

President, Members, Ch--Chairman Fraser, we've gone through a long

process on this and I--I'll be brief in my comments. What you saw today, and

the concerns of many who have proposed the amendment to this voter

identification bill, was to lessen the burden and to reduce the barriers that

would be imposed on many of the folks here in Texas with this. And, I just

wanna share that what we saw was s--some ability, at least, to try to mitigate

that. Let's hope it sticks, some of the amendments that were taken today,

let's h--let's hope it sticks through the process. But I have to tell you that I

am highly disappointed, because of several things, but mostly because I don't

really feel that we took care of the people who do have the greatest burden.

Most of us are very blessed to be on this Floor. We don't live in poverty. We

don't have problems with transportation. And some of us, probably, have

never had to have that really stark reality of where that next dollar's gonna

come from. But I have to share with you that at a time in our life, as well,

that my husband Pete and I had a very, very difficult time. In 1986, my

husband became very ill and was hospitalized for several months, being

hospitalized here and then to the Mayo Clinic. And, bein' a, a mom with a

pharmacy and another little flag business and four small children, very

quickly, we got behind, you know, w--almost losin' the car, in fact, havin' to

give up one, trying to bargain with the mortgage company to, to hold back a
little. And I got a second job, I had a day job and then a night job. And I tell you this because, before that time, the worst burden for me was unloadin' the groceries. I just despised the fact goin' to the groceries (sic), and with a big family and with grandparents living with us, that I would have to unload those groceries and walk from the car to the house, (from) the car to the house, and then put them up. It was a chore that I just hated to do. Well, in February '86 that kinda changed and for the next year, I ('atta) (sic) tell you, I went to the groceries with about a twenty-dollar bill, every other day, 'cause the cash flow was really tough. It took us awhile to get back on our feet, but pridefully, I guess, we, we didn't ask our parents for help through that. No, we just thought we could do it on our own, ya know, that's kinda what most Texans try to do. They, they try to do what they can. And, so, the time came where Pete got better and, after several months, was actually allowed to drive a car, and then to try to get his business back into shape, but I still worked that second job for several years. But, that first time I got to go back to the grocery store--

VAN DE PUTTE : (Background noise)

--and I got to get more than twenty dollars worth of stuff. And I got to load up, because, see, before that time I went to the grocery store and just wrote the check out, didn't even bother me, 'cause I knew we had enough money to cover for it. Well, when we got back on our feet and I got those groceries, on the way home, I pulled into the driveway, I just laid on the horn. I was beepin' the horn and screamin' for the kids to come out and help me. It was v--so joyous, it was so exciting, it was just, you cannot believe how wonderful it was to unload all these groceries, again. And, then it hit me how absolutely stupid I was. I never knew the joy of doin' somethin' that I thought was a burden before, 'cause I had never been in anybody's shoes. I had never been that poor. I had never been faced with transportation problems. And so, for those of us who hadn't had that, you know, it was the worst experience I had to ever go through in our life and it was the best experience I had to go through. They say that God never gives you anything you can't handle and we handled it. But it gave me a humility that I would've never experienced. And I think, ultimately led me to be a better mother, a better wife, a better business owner, and ultimately, hopefully, a better decision maker, here. My fear is that what we've done today, is that, although, we've helped slightly those folks who have that burden, we have placed so much on them, now, for just that basic right to vote. So, for us, we're blessed. But we must remember those that we represent and who live in this State, who, for them, that little bag of groceries is a constant. For them, the challenge of even getting anywhere, either in public transportation or in remote areas of this State, is constant. And, so, as we decide this framework of the most basic right, I am so sad, because in my heart, I feel that we have done a disservice to those who aren't as blessed as you and I. I'll vote no on this measure, because we can do a lot better.
PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Gallegos to speak against the bill.

GALLEGOS: Thank you, Mr. President. Members, we’ve heard hours of testimony on this issue and many of us on this Floor have been dealin’ with the, the issue for, for years now, and we have heard many conflicting sides of the issue, on both sides. The bottom line is none of us want to condone voter fraud. I think we can all agree on that. And, but the larger issue, as I see it today, is that I, I cannot live with—

(Inaudible, background conversation) (clearing of throat) (mush--d) (sic) cherished right any American can have. And it is unfortunate that, today, by moving this overly stringent, unnecessary bill through this Chamber, we are takin’ a step away from making sure that voting is fair and accessible to everyone. This bill does not serve to fix a problem. I’ve heard no testimony about any kind of voter fraud going on in my district, right now, that this bill would serve to eliminate. We have heard legitimate concerns from several of our colleagues on the Floor, and some of those who came to testify before the Committee. Concerns about whether the poor, elderly, disabled, and minority, many of the people that I represent, and a lot that y’all represent, Senator Duncan, in that they will be able to adapt to these restrictive provisions of this legislation without being disenfranchised. I share these concerns. And, yes, we’ve heard many hours of testimony on this bill over the last couple of days, and one re–really one witness that struck me, Members, was Jerry Bonnet, from the Indiana Secretary of State’s office. Just before testifying that a bus full of nuns conspired to defraud the state’s voting system, he noted that the sun came up after Indiana’s voter ID law passed. Well, you know, I know that the sun will come up tomorrow after this bill passes through this Chamber. And I know that the Governor, who has wrongly declared this issue as an emergency, signs the bill into law and the sun will come up then too. But I also know that when the day comes, a lot of the folks that I represent, good, hardworking folks, will find it harder and some will find it impossible to make it to the polls and participate in this democratic process. So, no, the world won’t end, but we sure won’t have made any progress towards a more accessible democracy for the kind of people I represent. And, m–Senator Fraser, you know, I, I beg to differ with ya, the Department of Public Service (sic) is all in this bill, it’s everywhere in your bill. And, and I, I think the amendments that my, some of my colleagues put out there should have been accepted, but they weren’t. Especially on, on transportation, to try to get access. So we’re gonna force these people to go get a photo ID, we at least should have access and transparency where they can go and get it without walking. Or like my grandfather did, he didn’t, he didn’t drive, my grandfather didn’t drive, he had a bicycle, where he goes, you know, but if you look at the map that I, that, tha--that’s a long bicycle ride, you know, to
the edge of b--edge of the other side of town to get a photo ID. Now I come from a firefighting background and I know the shortcuts. And I've looked at the map on where all the DPS centers are, and I know the back roads, and I know the shortcuts, and I know I can get, probably, to one of these centers. It'll take me every bit, even takin' the shortcuts, and I have a car, it'd take me about 45 minutes to get to the other side of town. But the people I represent, they don't know the shortcuts. They don't know the streets that I know. They don't know how to, how to avoid all them, all them red lights to get to the other side of town like I do, and that's who I'm really thinking about, the ones that don't know the shortcuts. The ones that don't have a car like I do. The ones that don't have the money, you know, to even get to the other side of town, like we do, here on this Floor. And those are the ones really, I believe, that are bein' disenfranchised today, and they're bein' left out of the loop. You know, like I said, Senator Fraser, DPS is all in this bill and this is the right time to talk about how to get there and what DPS's role is gonna be. And we just got a letter, Members, from, from the, the, the Secretary of State on the fiscal note that we talked about yesterday. You know, and that note, that note, that letter said that in the methodology there was two components to come up with in Missouri, in--in Missouri. This was the, the, the Missouri fiscal note that I was talking about yesterday. They're nineteenth in this country and we're number two. The fiscal note that they put over, they had two components, one for education and one to provide the free ID, and that came up to ten million dollars in two years, and, and the fiscal note that I saw, it shows two million. Now, they're p--you know, the only thing that I can really come up with is that their paper is more expensive in Missouri, 'cause we're talkin' about only 5.9 million people, not 25 million that we have here. So, obviously, you know, it's, may--maybe it's more expensive there, I don't know. But, but 5.9 million as opposed to 25 million, I don't get the math, and I really don't, really don't get the math. Now I was born at night but not last night, Senator Fraser. And I know exactly what the bill says, DPS is all in it, you should've accepted some of our amendments. And because I feel that my folks are not represented under this bill and they're denied access to the democracy where they d--deserve the right to vote, I will be voting no on this bill. 

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Rodriguez to speak a--against the bill.

RODRIGUEZ: Thank you, Mr. President, I appreciate that. Members, as you know, I am the newest Member of this distinguished body. And, I came here, frankly, with a great deal of enthusiasm and with hopeful anticipation that we would have a very productive Session to resolve the critical issues that face our great State. And I do appreciate, very sincerely, the warmth and the cordiality and the tremendous welcome that I got by all of you, every single one of you a--as a new Member. I have, in fact, been very attentive throughout the consideration of this voter ID bill and I must say that I am baffled by the, by
the proceeding. I am, in some ways, I guess, I should say I’m also frustrated, as Senator Davis pointed out yesterday, that there was a lot of frustration here in the room. I could feel it, and I certainly felt it myself. Now, I’m going home tomorrow with Senators Ogden and Senator Williams, to El Paso, so that we can review the border security and border violence that’s takin’ place in El Paso, and so, we have a very important meeting. But I know, I know that when I get there and face my constituents after that meeting, and then, also, meetings on, on Friday and Saturday, that I’m gonna be asked, by my constituents, questions, many questions, in fact, about the, the weeks, the liberations here. And I know they’re gonna ask me, for example, why is this issue an emergency, especially in the face of the budget crisis. They’re goin’ to ask me is voter fraud a real problem in this State. They will ask why is this a prob--why is this problem takin’ precedence over all the other problems that we are facing at this time. What’s gonna happen to our schools, what’s gonna happen to health care. How am I going to respond to my constituents on these questions? Now, as elected officials, isn’t it our responsibility to increase participation in the democratic process. And I think some of my colleagues have very eloquently spoken to that issue. And I’ve been very impressed with the passion and the, and the commitment and sincere concern that they have, as I do, with this bill, and with a rejection of some of the amendments that were intended to, as was pointed out by my colleague, Senator Gallegos, to, and, and Senator Van de Putte, to open up the process some more for those who may face some barriers. I believe that, as elected officials, it is our responsibility to increase participation in the democratic process, not to decrease the participation. And I think we heard yesterday, but I’m gonna repeat it again, that in 2010 only 71 percent of the Texas voting age population was registered to vote, and, of that, only 38 percent cast a ballot in, in the, in the election. Back home in, in El Paso, in El Paso County, turnout was even lower with just 23 percent of registered voters, 66 percent of whom are Latino showing up at the polls, dismal turnout as far as I’m concerned. What will I say to those who ask me why, if less than a quarter of El Paso’s, El Pasoans voted in the last election, are we in the Legislature so intent on making it more difficult for people to vote, at least in my opinion. How can I answer these questions honestly, sincerely, and with respect, both for my constituents and this body, the Senate. I ask you what, what your advice is to me on how to answer these questions. My fellow Senators, I cannot in good faith defend how we have, frankly, spent, you know, our time this week. I don’t think I'm gonna be able to look people in a straight face and, and answer that back home. I will have to b--be compelled to draw distinctions between the majority and the minority of the Senate, and I believe I’m gonna have to say that the majority i--is s--responsible, it was the sponsor of this bill. And, I will have to candidly say that I didn’t think that a lot of our concerns were heeded, that the pleas of the minority were not, were not heeded by the majority. I don’t know how else to explain the rejection of many amendments that I thought were very sensible,
reasonable efforts to try to mitigate whatever potential problems might be visited on those who want to cast a vote and participate in our democracy. I will have to say that on the major issues, such as this, the citizens represented by the minority have but a symbolic voice in this body, symbolic voice, because, I mean, we saw the vote pretty, pretty straightforward, down the line. I will have to say that on this issue, and I anticipate others coming down, and I think, Mr. President, you, you did in all fairness, point out to me when I first visited with you way back in July, that for the most part there and, not just you, but every single Member of this body that I talked to, literally, assured me that we will be able to find consensus, and reach consensus in this body, 90, or even above, percent of the time, that we are not like Washington. But that there would be, I think, in all fairness, people pointed out to me, some issues like voter ID, redistricting, and, and perhaps others that are coming down the pike, I know the sanctuary cities for example, which is a critical and important issue in my community, is gonna be one of those. That these issues were going to be divisive and that we were just gonna have to deal with them. But, quite frankly, I have to, I have to tell you, I, I just was not prepared for the experience of the rigid positions that on both sides without there havin' seemed to have been some kind of genuine attempt to try to look at each one of these provisions in the bill and the amendments, and try to come to some resolution, some consensus about ensuring, above all, that people have the opportunity to, to vote and to, and to not have people's rights violated, as has been the history in this State over the years, and, as the professor, yesterday, educated us, reminded us about it. So, I, I feel that I'm gonna have to say to them that on these kinds of issues we are deeply divided in this State and that we will need to stay vigilant to protect the rights and interests of just the regular folk, the regular people in this State. Those people that have been alluded to by my colleagues are hardworking people that wanna participate, that need to participate in order to make our State a strong state. So, Members, I cannot, in good conscience, support this bill, and so, I feel compelled to vote against it. Thank you for your, for your time. Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Chair recognizes Senator West to speak against the bill.

WEST: Thank you very much, Mr. President. Senator Rodriguez, make certain that you also tell our brothers and sisters in El Paso that elections have consequences, and these are the consequences, there's a manifestation of consequences of elections, that's what this is. Members, we have de--decided to place voter ID, even though it's an emergency item, at the top of our agenda, once again. We come into this Session with our school districts in financial trouble. We come into this Session with our counties, our cities in a financial crisis, and we put voter ID first. The majority has decided to do that. We come into this body, first thing I, now I understand we, we've had our political differences, we put on red jerseys and blue jerseys, the first, right out of the box. We talk about voter
fraud, and I know that Senator Fraser has said that over and over again. But if you really did an analysis of it, the fraud is in absentee balloting, that's where it is. We've done nothing to address that. We've dealt with voter ID. You pretty much heard the same testimony that I heard as it relates to what the cost of this bill is. You heard through, through, through the representative from the Department of Public Safety, that they have not really been able to qualify exactly how much this is goin' to cost. My desk mate talked about the cards costin' a dollar and sixty-seven cents, but you also heard they have not been able to get to what the cost will be, because they really have no idea how many Texans will need these ID cards. They're gonna need some additional GR, general revenue, in order to fund this. You also heard, and if you still have your fiscal note, that there's goin' to be a cost on counties. And many of us have said there will be no unfunded mandates. (Laughter) The reality is, is that, right in the fiscal note, Bexar County will have to spend at least three hundred and eighty-one thousand dollars, that's just one county. Where do they get the money from? Are they gonna get it from the State? Some of you may say, okay, Senator, they may very well be able to use some of the federal funds. How do you know that all of those dollars that they say they're gonna have to spend will be federal funds? You know (when you're in the) b--in your (various) school districts that there's gonna be a layoff, in our school districts. But yet, and still, we couldn't pass an amendment to basically guarantee the people of the State of Texas that we will do everything in our power to make certain that we keep our teachers in the classroom, so they can provide the instructions necessary, in order to make certain that our children can compete. Now there'll be bills that talk about, this Session, increasing the student-teacher ratio. There'll be bills that d--will do that. But we decided, or it will be decided, that we could not support an amendment that would tell the citizens of the State of Texas that we will make certain that all of the general revenue that we can will be used not for implementing a voter ID bill, but first, makin' certain that we maintain the number of teachers in our classroom. We decided not to do that. We decided to make certain that we would not pass any unfunded mandates. I--I challenge us, as a body, and those of you that have decided that this is the direction that the State needs to go in, that as this bill goes through the process, that you take a very close look at whether or not there are any unfunded mandates that we're passing on. And whether or not we're gonna take general revenue--

WEST : (Inaudible, background conversation)  

WEST : --in order to support implementation of this particular bill that could otherwise be used to help fund the public schools in the State of Texas. Elections, Senator Rodriguez, have consequences, and these are the consequences of the elections. I hope and I pray, Members, that we take off our blue and red jerseys after tonight and take care of the business of the citizens of the State of Texas.

PRESIDENT : The Chair recognizes Senator Lucio to
speak against the bill.

LUCIO : Thank you, Mr. President. (Clearing of throat) Mr. President and Members, I guess, I'll be very brief. We, we had a chance in this process to craft a bipartisan bill, I truly believe we passed up on that opportunity. I just don't know how an election bill can have any credibility without bipartisan support, especially, in this final outcome. The bigger picture is that we need to professionalize the entire way we administer elections in Texas. The fact that we don't have the technological infrastructure in place to allow people to register and vote on polling day, in my humble opinion, is un-fortunately, shameful. The fact that we don't have the political will to invest in that infrastructure is again, unfortunately, just as shameful. Electoral reform should be paid for with revenue, not rights. I wanna speak briefly in closing about the Senate rules. This body decided last week to amend the rules and bypass the two-thirds rule regarding voter ID, some of us are very disappointed by that. But we only changed the rules re--regarding voter ID. In other words, I'm going to take a leap of faith and assume that the rules, as they stand, still reflect the desire of this Chamber to produce a bipartisan budget. To take a bipartisan approach to the huge fiscal problems we are facin' in Texas. That's the approach that I started with when I came to that, this Chamber in 1991, and I look forward to moving on in that direction. Thank you.

PRESIDENT : Thank you, Senator Lucio. The Chair recognizes Senator Zaffirini to, speak against the bill.

ZAFFIRINI : Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President and Members, I rise to join my Democratic colleagues in voting against Senate Bill 14, which was supported unanimously by our Republican colleagues. And, basically, Members, what I worry about is the future. We who are the political minority in this body do not want to simply be heard, we want to be at the table, we want to participate, and we want to have impact. And starting my 25th year in the Texas Senate, what I worry about in looking back on what happened today, is what does this say for the rest of the Session. I hope that once voter ID is off the table and dealt with that we can come back on a bipartisan basis and address the real issue, the most important issue facing the Senate, and that is the budget that we must adopt. And I hope that in that process all of us, all 31 of us, will have an opportunity to have an impact, not simply to be heard. There're many reasons to oppose this bill. One, is the unknown cost. Look at the fiscal note. How can you possibly take that fiscal note seriously? It simply does not address the unknown costs that we are worried about. And I won't belabor the point and repeat them, because I identified them for you yesterday. Look at the unfunded mandates. They're incredible, they're incredible unfunded mandates, and yet it's so easy to rise and say, we will not pass any bill that calls for an unfunded mandate. How can anyone say that with a straight face. This bill also causes problems in terms of lack of accessibility, and I won't repeat what we pointed out earlier. You saw the map that shows that
there are 77 counties without DPS offices. You heard the testimony about
the negative impact on certain categories of women, on low-income persons,
on minorities, on persons with disabilities. There were good amendments
offered to cure those problems and, yet, they were rejected on partisan lines.
I know that there were people in this Chamber who wanted to vote for some
of those amendments and simply did not. That’s very difficult for me to
understand. Remember what the sh--etter that I shared with you from the
Carter-Baker Commission and, specifically, they said very clearly, that one
commissioner said very, very clearly, in black and white, that this bill is
inconsistent with the recommendations of the Carter-Baker Commission.
What else do we need? What else do we need to realize that this bill certainly
is not satisfactory? And equally important, Members, what does today say
about the importance of the two-thirds rule? This bill will go, will pass along
partisan lines, because there is no two-thirds rule. Were there a two-thirds
rule in effect, we would’ve had to achieve consensus. The Lieutenant
Governor could’ve been at his best, the way he has been on so many bills, and
brought us together and said, reach a consensus, and we didn’t. I will be
voting against this bill for many reasons, some of which I repeated today.
And I hope that more of you could join us in voting no, but I understand the
outcome, I see it clearly, it makes me sad. Thank you, Mr. President and
Members.

PRESIDENT : The Chair recognizes Senator
WHITMIRE to speak against the bill.

WHITMIRE : Thank you, Mr. President and
Members. The hour is late, but if you’ll allow me to speak, the good news is,
we’ve conducted ourself(sic) in a very civil, respectful manner, which, which
I’m sure we’re all proud. The bad news is, some of you are about to pass a bill
that in my judgment, based on the testimony, has unlimited, unintentional
consequences. As recently as two days ago, I was thinkin’, what would I say
if I really had an opportunity to speak to my colleagues. I would say, well, I
would probably say to Senator Rodriguez and Senator Birdwell, welcome to
the State Senate, this is your first major piece of legislation. And from my
experience, gentlemen, two days ago, I would’ve called this bill pretty typical
of what you'll witness, if you'll bear with me. You're gonna find as we go
through legislation that the proponents are gonna make somethin' sound like
they just, the State has to have it, and the opponents are gonna talk about
the negative consequences. The truth of the matter is, from my years of
experience is, normally, the proponents are stating a situation that's not
nearly as good as they would state, which I certainly think this bill fits.
Oftentimes in the debate, the opponents, things aren't nearly as bad as they
say they're going to be. It's normally somewhere in between. But I can't say
that tonight after having the testimony given. I have to honestly say this bill
is worse than the opponents have stated. All you have to do, Members, is
remember the testimony of the DPS. It was so unfair, in my judgment, to
have that lady there. I work very close with the DPS. I knew she'd taken
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Michael Kelley's position only last June. She was not equipped to answer the questions, 'cause quite honestly, no one with DPS was probably prepared, 'cause it's all based on (specum--galation) (sic). The implementation of Senate Bill 14 has not been thought through. Senator Fraser, we have not put ourself in other people's shoes. The surcharge example, itself, shows how flawed this bill is. Some Senators might say, well, they're, they're lawbreakers in the first place. Le' me (sic) give ya an example of someone that came to my office. Woman comes to my office, a waitress, goin' back with her husband says, Senator Whitmire, I need help. We're driving without a license, 'cause my husband, because he was broke and unemployed, could not pay the surcharge. We're driving without a license. Senator Ogden, the unintended consequences this bill is, you're gonna force that person to go to the DPS office, where they owe six thousand dollars, and be concerned about can they go and leave without bein' apprehended. It has unintended consequences that none of us can anticipate until it's passed and placed in law. Now let me tell you a real concern that each and every one of you oughta have. We have given the DPS an assignment, one, that they didn't want. They don't want, in my judgment. They wanna be securing the Border. They wanna be patrollin' our highways. Do you know the DPS, tonight, is 300 positions short of troopers from authorized levels. They can't compete with the cities for what the cities pay their police officers. I know DPS officers and their staff wanna be enforcin' the laws, they want to take DWI drivers off the road, they wanna secure the Border. Some of you are goin' to the Border (tomorra) (sic) to meet with the DPS and see what we can do more to secure our Border usin' our best police force, our Texas Rangers have swat teams down there. And what have we done, an underfunded agency that can't recruit people, 'cause they can't pay 'em competitive salaries, we've given them the voter registration police assignment. Now they've got to go into DPS offices in Houston, where I routinely get call (sic) because people wait two and three hours. They call me to see if I can get them in line at the front to go back to work. But now, they're gonna be in charge of handling voter registration, for all practical purposes. There are unintended (consiousquinces) (sic) to this bill that no one knows about. But I promise you it's not worse, Senator Rodriguez, than what the opponents claim, it's not as bad as what the opponents claim, it's worse. And it's too bad that we find ourself about to implement something, in my judgment, for political purposes, that's gonna, in my judgment, harm the State of Texas. You talk about polls, it's all about how you ask the questions. And, quite frankly, I don't think we oughta govern by polls, Senator Fraser, or you'd probably have casino gambling and no tellin' what else that you'd probably not agree with the poll on. I think we've not put ourself in other people's shoes. I think, unfortunately, some of us have only looked at how it would affect the communities in which you live. Let me close by saying, we need to remember this, this experience. I'm of the opinion that without the two-thirds, with the two-thirds rule, without the special order provision, we
wouldn't be about to pass this bill. You need to remember it, the amendments on the Floor, how they were handled, and some of you may like it, some of you may like it and say it was fine. But I know, for a fact, before we had the special order, as recently, or goin' back as far as two years ago, there was great dialogue about what our voter ID bill ought to have in it. We almost, I thought, made the progress. Of course, same day registration was one of the considerations that the Democrats wanted. It was a deal killer from other side of the aisle. That's fine--the bill wouldn't've been in it. But I promise you, with the two-thirds rule, some of the amendments that were turned down today, in my judgment, would've been included. If you watched the process today, Senator Patrick, the votes were very predictable. In fact, people were not workin' the Floor, Members, as we normally do to try to acquire support for your amendments. A reporter asked me the other day, said, well, can you, can you tell us what the outcome's gonna be. I can tell you exactly what the outcome's gonna be. Nineteen people are gonna pass it, twelve are gonna be opposed to it, as we've witnessed. So, as we go forward, I hope we'll remember, maybe you like it, maybe you don't. Today, I actually saw, Senator Duncan, I thought that one side of the aisle, or the nineteen that had the majority, were so in control and not needing to converse with others, that one of the minority Member's amendment was actually used by the other side. It certainly appeared that way. I don't think the best bill that we could have passed, if we wanted voter ID, and, and, Senator Fraser, we're very familiar with the issue. I know how concerned the public is. We share that, we're against fraud, we share the concern about the integrity of the ballot box, as, as professional politicians we share that concern. You know, I don't know what kind of knock-down-drag-out campaigns you've been in, I've been in several. I've been in 'em with a Hispanic opponent in a Hispanic neighborhood. And people come to me and say, you oughta be concerned about the registration process across your district. Fraud, as Senator West points out, does not happen on election day, it happens in the early voting. If we had the time, if you wanted to hear about it, I can tell you how I've witnessed that. We haven't addressed that. But the thing that disturbs me the most, as we go forward, is the lack of give and take, the amendment process, the fact that we didn't spend hours tryin' to define what the best bill that a majority of folks, certainly, two-thirds plus could support. Now, let me just close by sayin', if you like it because 19 folks got to run this place today, with little consideration for the other points of view, the next time it may not be a partisan fight, Senator Birdwell. It could very easily be 12 Democrats and 7 Republicans, or it could be an urban coalition of 19, or it could be any philosophical group of people. And they won't have to slow down and take one of these green sheets and painfully walk around (sometime), and go desk to desk to make sure on each and every amendment that they've got their vote. And they sure won't have to go get a two-thirds count before they bring it up. In closing, the only thing I can say good about the point we are right now, before we vote, is the good news is, this thing is out of our way, this bill
is outta the way for the time bein'. And now we can go to work on, Troy,
what I think the public would poll as the number one concern, the shortfall.
All you gotta read is any paper in this State about what the school districts
are facin'. They're scared, they're (at) a crisis, they consider that an
emergency. And it's interesting, the Governor didn't make the budget an
emergency, we did, Senator Ogden. We essentially decided that four-fifths of
us were gonna make that an emergency. The school districts are scared. I
got calls today from Goose ki--Creek in Baytown, they don't know what to do.
That's what they wanna talk about and the good news is voter ID is out of our
way and now we can go to what the public believes is a true emergency. You
know, what I perceive is an emergency, that you labeled the voter ID, an
emergency is to me somethin' you feel like you need to call 9-1-1 on, that
you're really in an urgent state. I made reference the other day how many
people are followin' this debate, darn few, based on the participation tonight.
But I do wanna close by sayin', it's been a great, civil debate, we oughta be
proud of that. At the time that Washington, last night, was makin' headlines
and news just 'cause they sat with one another, we routinely share each
other's company, concern for each other, and we oughta go forward in that
environment and deal with the public's business. Thank you.

PRESIDENT : (Inaudible, background conversation)
PRESIDENT : The Chair recognizes Senator Fraser
for a motion to move Senate Bill 14 to engrossment.
FRASER : Mr. President, I would now move
passage to engrossment of Senate Bill 14.
PRESIDENT : Members, you've heard the motion by
Senator Fraser, the Secretary will call the roll.
Williams. Zaffirini.
PRESIDENT : (Gavel) Members, there being 19 ayes
and 11 nays, Senate Bill 14 passes to engrossment. (Gavel)

END OF EXCERPT