SEN. HEGAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Nichols, I was curious, you were talking about Port Lavaca -- the Port Lavaca case, and that's in Senate District 18, which I represent, and you were finishing your comments on that or part way through, and I just wanted to make sure that you were able to finish your comments on that particular case. And I was also curious when you were finishing those comments, because that was a really unique set of circumstances in a three-way race, if I remember, did the voter fraud change the outcome of that election? If you could finish that up for me, please?

MR. NICHOLS: Yes, sir. Just very briefly that case involved a situation where the defendant in the case presented voter registration applications to seven persons who were not qualified to vote because they were noncitizens. The facts of the case as presented at trial showed that the defendant filled out the application on behalf of these persons who were resident aliens, but were not qualified to vote or eligible. The defendant basically misrepresented facts to these resident aliens and took those completed applications to the local elections office to be processed.

And the evidence further revealed that
of the folks that were registered, two of the
noncitizens, in fact, voted early in person at a Party
Primary Election. And because the defendant had
misrepresented things to these resident aliens, it was
a situation where not only the election system was put
in jeopardy, but these victims -- we considered the
resident aliens to be victims because, in fact, she
had subjected them to a situation where, if they were
prosecuted, there could be ramifications for them as
well.

In terms of the outcome of the election
which you asked about, the testimony at trial showed
that the noncitizen votes did affect the outcome of
the election. In that case, it was a three-way race.
The defendant received 229 votes. Her runners up
received 211 and 210 respectively. And after the
count was had, the two lower tallied candidates had to
do a coin flip in order to determine who was going to
be in the runoff. And then as the D.A -- local D.A.
who helped prosecute the case said the defendant's
conduct "would have swayed the entire election."

SEN. HEGAR: Thank you. I really
appreciate that. And one thing that you said I wanted
to make sure I heard that correctly, did you say that
your office prosecuted the case or it was the locals,
or did you say that was joint? I was just curious on that.

MR. NICHOLS: We did it together as we often do. In many of these cases, we prosecute in conjunction with -- actually in that case it was two local D.A.s.

SEN. HEGAR: Okay.

MR. NICHOLS: The case originated in Calhoun County. That was where the city councilwoman was from where the election was had. The case was moved under change of venue to Jackson County, and so we actually had two local elected D.A.s that were involved in that case.

SEN. HEGAR: Okay. Great. Thank you very much for your testimony. I appreciate it. Thank you.

SEN. DUNCAN: Sen. Davis?

SEN. DAVIS: Hello, Mr. Nichols. Thank you for waiting so long to come before us today and present your testimony. I just have a couple of questions for you. A moment ago -- I want to make sure I heard you correctly. You said that from August of 2002 to the present 192 referrals of voter fraud -- alleged voter fraud had been made to the Office of the Attorney General?
MR. NICHOLS: That's correct, alleged election code violations.

SEN. DAVIS: Okay. And that you act only on referrals because you don't have the manpower and the ability to go out policing polling places through the Attorney General's Office?

MR. NICHOLS: And, Senator, it's not really just a manpower issue, but it's just a mandate issue. We're not intended to be the -- a front-line monitor of the elections.

SEN. DAVIS: Understood. Of those 192 referrals, you broke them down in terms of where the referrals came from. You also broke them down with regard to the type of elections in which those referrals occurred. Can you tell me -- and I'm sure you said this a moment ago, but I didn't catch it -- how many prosecutions resulted from those 192 referrals?

MR. NICHOLS: It was 30.

SEN. DAVIS: Thirty, okay. And I think you did this a moment ago, too, but I didn't catch all of it. Can you break down of the 30 prosecutions the categories in which each of those were prosecuted?

MR. NICHOLS: Categories as with respect to the type of election or --
SEN. DAVIS: Exactly -- no, not the type of election, but the type of fraud that occurred that you were prosecuting.

MR. NICHOLS: I don't have those figures for you. I can tell you generally that some involved the abuse of the mail-in ballot process, some involved campaign finance violations, unlawful conduct of polling places and other obstruction, but I could break those down for you further if you want me to get you that information.

SEN. DAVIS: Okay. I would appreciate it if you would do that breakdown for us and supply it to the Members.

You did say I think a moment ago that one of those cases involved a voter impersonation, and that was the situation where a woman sent in a mail-in ballot of her deceased mother. Correct?

MR. NICHOLS: That's one of the cases, yes.

SEN. DAVIS: Okay. I am reading a communication from our Attorney General Greg Abbott. It was an Internet communication titled Let's Stamp Out Voter Fraud in Texas. And in that communication the Attorney General states that "Voter fraud is occurring on a large scale when viewed statewide, and
consequently our state elections are significantly impacted. We must redouble our efforts to stem this epidemic." And again, that's dated March 1, 2006. But I want to make sure I understood you a moment ago. This epidemic involved 192 referrals made from your office from August 2002 to the present?

MR. NICHOLS: If your question is did we receive -- did our office receive 192 referrals during that period you mentioned, that's correct.

SEN. DAVIS: Okay. And then further in that communication -- and this goes to support the answers that you gave to Senator Huffman a moment ago. Attorney General Abbott talks about the $1.5 million grant and the way in which he's going to use that grant through the powers of his office. And he states that "Officers from the Special Investigation Unit have been visiting key counties across the state to conduct voter fraud training for law enforcement. Included among these counties are the 14 where my office has previously investigated or prosecuted alleged election code violations. In addition to the ones mentioned above, the list includes comal, Floyd, Harris, Hidalgo, Jim Wells, Parker, Robertson, Tarrant and Waller Counties. Criminal investigators from SIU are also visiting 30 other Texas counties with
populations of at least 100,000. Together these 44 counties contain more than three quarters of eligible registered voters in the state. As of mid February, a total of 519 officers had attended 76 sessions offered." And again, this was a communication on March 1, 2006.

With the expenditure of that $1.5 million grant which went to aggressively train law enforcement throughout our state and which, of course, was used in part, I think you said, for purposes of rooting out and prosecuting voter fraud to quote the statement by the Attorney General in this communication, with all of that money and all of that training and all of this focus on what is an effort "to stem an epidemic," from August 2002 to the present, there were only 192 referrals made and investigations pursued by the Attorney General's Office of election fraud allegations in the State of Texas?

MR. NICHOLS: Senator, it was a lot in that question, but I think I tried to clarify in response to an earlier question about the 1.5. So to the extent that anyone is operating under a misapprehension that that 1.5 million was spent on election code cases alone, that's what I was trying to
clear up for the record.

But again, if your question to me is not taking into account local prosecutors, what referrals our agency has seen to the three sources I talked about, you're correct, it's 192 over the time period August 2002 to the present.

SEN. DAVIS: Thank you very much, Mr. Nichols. I don't have any further questions.

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair recognizes Sen. Wentworth.

SEN. WENTWORTH: Mr. Nichols, it's pretty late, and I didn't hear everything that was said, but I want to make sure I did understand because I had heard it repeated several times that your office hadn't spent $1.4 million on this. I think in response to Senator Huffman you reported that, in fact, it's not $1.4 million. It's not even $100,000. It's less than $100,000. So $1,300,000 plus went to other things from that grant rather than election fraud cases. Did I -- did I hear that correctly?

MR. NICHOLS: Yes, sir. And in fact --

SEN. WENTWORTH: What was -- what was the exact figure?

MR. NICHOLS: Yes, sir. There were two figures. The initial grant was funded at 1.4. It was
renewed for another year through the Governor's Office for 1.9. So actually ultimately there was a total of 3.3 in grant funding for the Special Investigations Unit, which $3.1 million was ultimately spent by the SIU. And of that $3.1 million, $93,579 was spent on election code cases. Now, of course, we've spent more money than that on election code cases and prosecutions, but the suggestion that $1.4 million in grant funding was spent to prosecute 30 cases is -- is completely inaccurate.

SEN. WENTWORTH: Thank you, sir.

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair recognizes Sen. Shapleigh.

SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Nichols, I believe Sen. Huffman is going to offer this exhibit. You and I looked at it. This was prepared by you and your office. I think it's going to be hopefully Exhibit No. 38. I'm looking here at SIU funding. Here is what this says. "The initial $1.9 million DOJ grant was renewed for approximately $2.0 million. To date the OAG has resolved 22 election fraud prosecutions at a cost of $600,000. Of those 22, eight election fraud indictments are now pending."

So can you tell us of the 22 election
fraud prosecutions, which are the sum of the activity from the 192 referrals, how many involved minorities?

   MR. NICHOLS: How many involved what, sir?

   SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Minorities.

   MR. NICHOLS: I can't tell you. I don't track cases by that. I would never do that.

   SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Okay. Thank you.

   SEN. DUNCAN: There are no other members in queue for this witness. You are excused, Mr. Nichols.

   MR. NICHOLS: Thank you.

   SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you for your testimony.

   The Chair recognizes Sen. Watson to introduce an exhibit.

   SEN. WATSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

When the Deputy Secretary of State was here, I identified with him an exhibit that was a page from the House, a report that they had made from the Secretary of State's Office to the House Elections Committee that had two categories. It was voter -- registered voters since January 1, 2006 was in the upper category, and then there was a breakdown, and then all statewide voters. That has been marked as
Exhibit No. 38, and I would offer that as part of the record.

SEN. DUNCAN: All right. Senator, it will be made a part of the record, Exhibit 38.

(Exhibit No. 38 marked and admitted)

SEN. DUNCAN: Sen. Huffman, for what purpose?

SEN. HUFFMAN: Yes, Mr. -- I just need to offer the exhibit that Mr. Nichols testified from. It will be Exhibit No. 39 for the record.

SEN. DUNCAN: Would you describe it?

SEN. HUFFMAN: It is the facts of the Special Investigations Unit that gave the numbers of the amounts spent on the prosecutions that Mr. Nichols testified to, and he was questioned by Sen. Davis and Sen. Shapleigh.

SEN. DUNCAN: That will be Exhibit 39. Correct?

SEN. HUFFMAN: Yes, yes.

SEN. DUNCAN: All right. It will be placed into the record.

(Exhibit No. 39 marked and admitted)

SEN. HUFFMAN: Thank you, sir.

SEN. DUNCAN: Sen. Williams, for what purpose?
SEN. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, I have two documents that I'd like to enter into the record. One is the Supreme Court Case William Crawford vs. Marion County Election Board, and the other document is the amicus brief that the State of Texas filed with the Supreme Court of the United States in the same case.

SEN. DUNCAN: Okay. I believe the case would be Exhibit No. 40, and the amicus brief that you referred to would be Exhibit 41.

SEN. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SEN. DUNCAN: And they will be admitted in the record.

(Exhibit Nos. 40 and 41 marked and admitted)

SEN. DUNCAN: All right. Members, that concludes the invited testimony. I will now at this point in time -- here is the intent of the Chair, is to move into our public testimony. We have been going about two hours, so it's time for our court reporter to take a break.

But before we do that, I'm going to read the names of those ten witnesses that we will ask for you to come to the registration desk, and you'll be admitted and made ready to enter the chamber and give your testimony. And then as that process goes on,
we'll sooner -- we will call at some time later ten
more witnesses and ask you to report.

Again, at this point in time, we will
invoke the 30-minute rule again.

(Inaudible)

SEN. DUNCAN: No, the 30-minute rule
will mean that if you -- if your name is called and
you haven't arrived in 30 minutes, then you would lose
your opportunity to testify. So please -- please try
to adhere to that. Each witness will have three
minutes, and that limit will be strictly enforced.

The first witness I'll call is Claire
Oxley Gluck; the second witness, Hazel Cotton; the
third witness, Cathy Hicks; the next witness
James E. Carter; the next is Rusty Hicks; the next
is Tina Benkiser; the next is B.R. Skipper Wallace;
the next witness is Anita Pruett -- or Privett, I'm
sorry, P-R-I-V-E-T-T, 1212 Guadalupe, No. 107, Austin,
Texas, League of Women Voters; Mary Ann Collins of
Dumas Texas; Rosa Rosales, and those will be the
first -- that will be the first panel of witnesses to
bring into the chamber one at a time.

SEN. FRASER: Mr. Chairman?

SEN. DUNCAN: Who is this, Sen. Williams? Sen. Fraser?
SEN. FRASER: A question of the Chair, please.

SEN. DUNCAN: State your question.

SEN. FRASER: Could we get a clarification on the intent of the Chair, is that obviously these people that have been here all night and have registered, obviously we want to hear from all of them, but the question would be that the people that have registered, are those the people that will be testifying on the bill? And the question would be if someone came in two hours from now and attempted to register, are we -- the testimony that we're hearing, is it going to be for the people that have registered for the bill right now?

SEN. DUNCAN: It is for people that have registered for the bill.

SEN. FRASER: If someone attempted to register an hour from now --

SEN. DUNCAN: Senator, we're still open for public testimony.

SEN. FRASER: Thank you.

SEN. DUNCAN: The committee will stand at ease until 7 a.m.

(REcess: 6:50 a.m. to 7:03 a.m.)
SEN. DUNCAN: Okay. Members, we are now ready to begin our public testimony. I'll give you just a second to take your seats.

(Brief pause)

All right. The Chair will call the first public witness, Claire Oxley Gluck. Ms. Gluck, please approach, state your name, who you represent. You have three minutes.

TESTIMONY BY CLAIRE OXLEY GLUCK

MS. GLUCK: Mr. President, Distinguished Senators, I'm Claire Oxley Gluck from Boerne in Kendall County, Sen. Wentworth's district. Thank you -- I'm representing myself. Thank you for this opportunity to testify on an issue of fundamental importance to our democracy, the right to vote.

My husband, who is Jewish, has often quoted a poem from Martin Niemoller which I would like to paraphrase to illustrate what is at stake. "In Texas they first disenfranchised the homeless, and I did not speak up because I was not homeless. Then they disenfranchised the poor and elderly, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't poor or elderly. Then they disenfranchised the students, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a student. And then they
disenfranchised me, and there was no one left who
would speak up." So I must now speak up clearly.

We in this chamber are, for the most part, people of privilege. We are educated and so we know how to fight for our rights. We have homes and so we have addresses. We have cars so we have driver's licenses. We would not be affected personally by Senate Bill 362, but we have a duty to ensure that no Texan is prevented from voting for lack of a government-issued photo ID.

It's important to reiterate that we all want fair elections. They are the cornerstone of our democracy. One element of fairness is the prevention of fraud. An equally important element is universal suffrage. The problem with Senate Bill 362 is that it would reduce fairness rather than promote it. This bill would hinder universal suffrage without addressing the main sources of voter fraud.

According to the witnesses we've heard over the last 24 hours and academic studies, nonpartisan studies, voter fraud is most likely to occur in absentee ballots, which this bill would not affect. Those studies also indicate that it is extremely rare for a person to go to a polling place and vote using someone else's voter registration card.
I urge you not to pass Senate Bill 362. It poses a sure threat of disenfranchising legitimate voters in order to prevent a hypothetical risk of fraud that has not been shown to occur. Thank you very much.

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Ms. Gluck. Any questions, Members?

(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair the hears none.

I appreciate your testimony today.

The next witness is -- I think she has a handout, and that will be exhibit -- Ms. Oxley's handout is Exhibit No. 42, and it will be admitted into the record.

(Exhibit No. 42 marked and admitted)

TESTIMONY BY HAZEL COTTON

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair calls Hazel Cotton. Ms. Cotton, you have three minutes. State your name and who you represent.

MS. COTTON: I'm Hazel Cotton. I'm from Texarkana, Texas. I am an election judge now. I have worked elections since the year 2000 in every capacity imaginable, clerk, poll worker, alternate judge, presiding judge. I have been presiding judge over eight elections starting in May 2006, which was a
local election.

Sen. Fraser talked about a lady in a funny hat that came to the poll twice with two different voter registration cards and attempted to vote both. I have a similar situation that happened to me in the 2000 General Election. It was my first, and the day was barely two hours old when a man came in in an unusual western shirt. He presented me with his voter card. I looked him up on the roll, found him and he voted.

You can imagine my surprise when an hour later he came in again and got in the other line as we were working two lines at the same time. He was going to vote. I saw him, and the election judge also saw him. She stared him down, and he left in a hurry. He was going to vote twice if he had not had on that unusual shirt. This could have been prevented had we had a decent voter ID law in place.

A lot of issues have been raised in the past 24 hours regarding ID cards. This is the 21st century. In theory everyone should have a picture ID. We use them for everything, as we mentioned earlier, from cashing a check to going through an airport. There are people who don't drive or can't drive. They can go to the Department of Public Safety and get an
ID card at a reasonable cost.

There is a blind woman who votes at my poll nearly every election. She uses such an ID card. I also am legally blind, and I have an ID, a picture ID that I wouldn’t leave home without. I do use it, and I would encourage you—all to -- for the reasons I have stated to pass the voter ID bill. Thank you very much.

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Ms. Cotton.

Ms. Cotton has written testimony. It's marked as Exhibit No. 43. It will be admitted into the record.

(Exhibit No. 43 marked and admitted)

SEN. DUNCAN: Are there any questions of the witness? The Chair hears none.

SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Mr. Chair? Mr. Chair, may I ask one question?

QUESTIONS FROM SENATE FLOOR

SEN. DUNCAN: Sen. Shapleigh, you're recognized.

Ms. Cotton, your -- we have a question.

SEN. SHAPLEIGH: I'm sorry. I just need to know the final end of the story here.

MS. COTTON: Oh.

SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Did you let him vote the second one -- the second time?
MS. COTTON: Okay. The second time the presiding judge saw the man, and they got into a staring contest at which time he left the poll.

SEN. SHAPLEIGH: So he did not vote the second time?

MS. COTTON: He did not vote. He actually left in a hurry. He left in a dead trot.

SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Thank you.

MS. COTTON: Uh-huh.

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Ms. Cotton.

MS. COTTON: Anything else?

SEN. DUNCAN: Members, any other questions?

(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: All right. The Chair hears none.

The next witness is Kathy Hicks.

TESTIMONY BY KATHY HICKS

MS. HICKS: I would like to thank everyone.

SEN. DUNCAN: Ms. Hicks, state your name and who you represent. You have three minutes.

MS. HICKS: My name is Kathy Hicks. I'm from Bowie County. I would like to thank all the Texas Senators here for the opportunity to speak in
front of you.

I have been studying election irregularities since 1992 and a poll watcher since 1996. I have a sworn affidavit from a Mr. Ira Stewart of Bowie County that was made available to me through American International Investigators out of De Leon, Texas.

On Mr. Ira Stewart's absentee by mail application that he did not request nor did he sign, the name "Ora Stewart" is filled in and the signature is signed. There was no registration number or application on the application by mail nor one filled in when stamped by the clerk.

I would like to read you his statement.

"My name is Ira Stewart. I'm above the age of 18 years and am of sound mind. I have a personal knowledge of the facts stated herein under oath as follows: I live at 104 Brown in Texarkana, Bowie County, Texas. I received an absentee ballot in the mail. I don't remember how a ballot was mailed to me or why. Willie Ray came by my house and asked me to sign the blank ballot. I did not fill it in. The ballot -- I did not fill the ballot in. The ballot -- but I did sign it. Ms. Ray then took my ballot and told me that she would take care of it. Mr. Don
Praiznor wrote this statement for me at my request.

This completes my statement."

As you-all will see, I made 40 copies.

Everybody has one. He cannot barely even sign his name. On his applications, they are signed as it was on his voter registration card back in 1988.

Back in 1996 we had a County Clerk named Marylene Megason. She was indicted. She was removed. I don't have a fact -- you will see as his voter registration card will show, there is an "i" inside of that "o." We believe that the County Clerk was in on helping change his application.

I also have here a Ms. Doris Harene Miles where she states she did not request or fill out an application for ballot by mail, and she doesn't know why she received an absentee ballot by mail. She stated that Willie Ray got her to fill out the absentee ballot, and Ms. Ray put the postage stamp on it, a sickle cell postage stamp, and took it. She later on went to the polls, and they said "oh, no, you have voted." So she did not get to vote, but actually she did vote, but she was confused because she didn't request the ballot, but the ballot came to her.

Also here I have a statement -- I'm going to leave it with you because I didn't make 40
copies -- which shows that Willie Ray came by another lady's house by the name of the Jolene -- did the same set up, she came by, she got the application, she came back when the ballot got there, but she told her how to vote because Murphy could care less how she voted. I'd like to leave this with you.

SEN. DUNCAN: All right. Thank you for your testimony. Ms. Hicks has presented written testimony, which will be Exhibit No. 44. It will be admitted into the record.

(Exhibit No. 44 marked and admitted)

SEN. DUNCAN: Are there any questions of Ms. Hicks?

(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Ms. Hicks, for your testimony in the Texas Senate.

TESTIMONY BY JAMES E. CARTER

SEN. DUNCAN: The next witness is James E. Carter. Mr. Carter, would you please approach, state your name, who you represent? And you have three minutes.

MR. CARTER: James Carter. I'm going to be speaking to you from two positions. One I have -- I am serving as the training officer for the Bell County Republican Executive Committee under the
provisions of 32.113 of the election code, which mandates that training be provided; secondly as an election judge, and I have been an election clerk and judge since about 1990 on my own in the precinct.

The training that I mentioned is given to the election judges and clerks. It is based on material provided by the Secretary of State and a handbook that's called the -- Training for the Judges and Clerks put out every two years. The current version is 2008-2009. A copy of that is provided to each election worker. It is of such a nature that it can be taken to the polls for reference purposes.

However, here is the key thing: The majority of these election workers may have worked only one, two, possibly three elections in a two-year period. Some are working for the first time, and yet they are expected to perform and serve anywhere from 30 to 50 percent of their precinct's eligible voters on election day. That is a tremendous amount of people to process in a short period of time, and yet they're expected to do it perfectly.

They take an oath to protect the integrity and purity of the election before the polls open. They take that oath very seriously and become very concerned when they lack a key tool to prove that
the individual appearing before them is who they represent themselves to be. That is a photo ID that verifies that person is exactly whom they represent.

After the polls have closed a couple weeks later, we have become aware that judges and clerks come in and say "I saw a person vote twice."

In the Primary, we're told that one person voted in the Republican Primary. Subsequently later that person was seen to exit the Democrat side on the other side.

We need to pass this bill to prevent consternation and protect the integrity of our election process. Thank you.

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr. Carter.

Members, are there any questions of Mr. Carter?

(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: All right. The Chair hears none. Thank you for your testimony.

TESTIMONY BY RUSTY HICKS

SEN. DUNCAN: Rusty Hicks? Mr. Hicks, you have three minutes. Please state your name and who you represent.

MR. HICKS: My name is Rusty Hicks. I'm a resident of Texarkana, Texas, in Bowie County. I've been active and concerned about the integrity of the
election process for many years. Over this time, I have discovered many irregularities in the voting process of Bowie County and the City of Texarkana, Texas. After inspecting the sign-in sheets of early voting in person, including the '08 Primary, it was discovered that three voters voted early in person claiming residency at an address no one seems to live.

After further inquiry into this matter, it was determined that this location was vacant and currently vacant to this day. This location is 1617 Gatling Street in Texarkana, Texas, which is owned by a standing city council member, Willie Ray, who voted using this address. It has been discovered that Ms. Ray actually resides at 574 County Road 1224 outside of Texarkana, Texas, outside the city limits since the year 2000.

If a proper and accurate and current photo ID was given at the polling place, the election judge would have discovered that these voters were ineligible to vote from this location. It is also a major concern that Ms. Ray is not eligible to obtain the city's council status. What is most alarming about this matter is that Ms. Ray had a lawsuit, state versus -- Ray vs. the State of Texas and claims residency owned -- under oath at 1617 Gatling Street.
in this federal lawsuit.

I appreciate the opportunity to testify in front of the Texas Senate. As you hear testimony for and against this voter ID bill, it is my experience that voter identification can only improve the integrity of the election process. My recommendation would be to vote yes for SB 362. And I do have an exhibit -- two exhibits of current next door neighbors to this Ms. Ray. They are sworn and notarized testimony that they have been living next to her for nine years.

SEN. DUNCAN: All right. Thank you, Mr. Hicks. That will be Exhibit 45, and it will be admitted into the record.

(Exhibit No. 45 marked and admitted)

SEN. DUNCAN: Do you have anything further?

MR. HICKS: No, sir.

SEN. DUNCAN: Okay. Members, are there any questions for Mr. Hicks?

(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: All right. The Chair hears none. Thank you for your testimony.

Members and also guests, we have -- I'll read the next ten witnesses. And if you'll report to
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the registration desk in the front, then you'll be admitted to the chamber: Dustin Rynders; Marcia Correira of Elgin, Texas; Rene Lara of Austin, Texas; Lee Medley of Santa Fe, Texas; John Watkins of Wells Point; Kenneth Flippin of Austin; Annie M. Banks of Houston; Rachel Hernandez, San Antonio; Renato de los Santos from Dallas; and Judy Holloway of Lakeway. Please report to the registration desk and you'll be admitted.

TESTIMONY BY TINA BENKISER

SEN. DUNCAN: The next witness is Tina Benkiser. Ms. Benkiser, please state your name, who you represent, and you have three minutes.

MS. BENKISER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Senators. My name is Tina Benkiser, and I'm Chairman of the Republican Party of Texas. I'm here to talk about election integrity, specifically safeguarding one of our most precious rights, the right to govern ourselves.

In choosing leaders, nothing is more important than voter confidence that our elections are fair and just. Vote fraud erodes that confidence, and in close races can result in unjust results. Moreover, every single fraudulent vote cancels out a valid vote by a hard-working Texan and undermines the
election process. Requiring a photo ID is a simple
common-sense tool to help ensure fair elections and
just outcomes.

The majority of votes in an election are
still cast on election day or at the polling place,
and the process is vulnerable to fraud. In person,
voter fraud is nearly impossible to detect at the time
if no photo ID is required, and it's rarely detected
afterwards unless an election contest occurs, and
those are rare, they are time consuming, and they are
expensive. And only in such cases can the immediate
effects of the fraud be reversed.

Requiring photo ID simply helps election
workers make sure that the person casting the vote at
the ballot box is the same qualified registered voter
that's listed in the poll book. In this age with more
than 40 million Americans moving every year and about
13 million voters in Texas, election judges just
cannot know everyone that comes to the polls,
especially in urban areas. So it's just common sense
that presenting a photo ID that matches the poll book
will better protect voters' rights.

Where photo ID has been instituted,
the process has been fairly easy. Contrary to
critic-style warnings, experience has shown no real
problems in requiring photo ID to vote. In Indiana and Michigan, it went into effect, 99 percent of the voting age population already had the required ID. Those who didn't voted a provisional ballot, and if they were eligible, the vote counted.

In looking at the impact of photo ID on voting behavior, one scholar has noted that critics' claims of coming to disenfranchisement are nothing more than irresponsible and ignorant exaggeration. You've heard testimony today that voter turnout increases, and the effect of photo ID was positive for counties with greater percentage of minorities and families in poverty.

In last year's election, states with the most stringent requirements had significantly higher turnout than did neighboring states with similar demographics that did not require the same. The real problem is that identity theft and voter impersonation are still alive and well. We've seen that in New York, we've seen huge scandals in Washington, Michigan, Missouri, Wisconsin and even next door in Louisiana.

The widespread popularity of voter ID suggests the general public is concerned about voter dilution for ineligible voters. Photo ID is common
sense. To ensure public confidence, I ask that you support Senate Bill 362. Thank you.

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Ms. Benkiser.

Are there any questions of the witness?

(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: All right. The Chair hears none. Thank you for your testimony.

TESTIMONY BY B.R. SKIPPER WALLACE

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair calls B.R. Skipper Wallace of Lampasas. Mr. Wallace, state your name and who you represent, and you have three minutes.

MR. WALLACE: My name is Skipper Wallace. I represent the Texas Republican County Chairmen's Association. I've been a county chairman for 17 years.

Since the days of LBJ in Duval County in 1948, we've known we've had a problem with voter identification at the polls. We've had a recent Rasmussen Poll on January 22, 2008 that showed 67 percent overall favored voter ID, 75 percent Republicans, 63 percent Democrats and Independents, and they all support voter ID.

Indiana -- we have an Indiana Supreme Court decision that says it's not a substantial burden
to have to get a voter ID. We have 12.7 million registered voters at the last Primary. We have 14 million DPS driver's licenses that are issued. We have 4 million Texas ID cards that have been issued, and we have another 5.3 million governmental IDs issued. The voting age population is 17.7 million. You guys can the do the math. I don't have to add it up for you.

I have a brother Sam. He has cerebral palsy. I've heard lots of testimony about the handicap and elderly. I have a mother that's 87 years old. Both of them have photo IDs. I asked them how much trouble it was to get them. They said "Well, all you had to do was go down to the DPS office. That was the biggest problem." I asked my brother -- the only thing he can do for himself is breathe and work the TV controller. And he said it was some trouble getting down to the -- to the DPS office. However, he said his right to vote and maintaining that right to vote was much more important than any inconvenience that he would have to go through to get his photo ID.

I've been an Election Official for 17 years. It is a simple fact that unless you know the person coming in to the polling place personally that you cannot refute who they are. It's impossible to
prove voter impersonation at the polls unless you personally know the person or the ID card. It just -- and that's the reason we don't have any cases.

I have confidence in the voting system. I think we need to take an ounce of prevention instead of a pound of cure and pass this Senate Bill 362.

Thank you.

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr. Wallace.

Members, are there any questions of Mr. Wallace?

(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair hears none.

Thank you for your appearance at the Texas Senate.

MR. WALLACE: Thank you.

TESTIMONY BY ANITA PRIVETT

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair calls Anita Privett. Ms. Privett, please state your name and who you present. Before you begin, we have your written testimony as Exhibit 46. It will be admitted into the record.

(Exhibit No. 46 marked and admitted)

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you. You have three minutes.

MS. PRIVETT: I'm Anita Privett. I represent the League of Women Voters of Texas. The League of Women Voters of Texas supports full voter
participation and opposes efforts that may create
barriers blocking this participation.

We have real concerns that Senate
Bill 362 creates needless barriers to citizen voter
participation and does not address the issue of
election fraud. It's been suggested that with the
requirement of a photo ID at the polling place
election fraud will be eliminated.

However, researchers have not found
widespread fraud that would be caught by photo --
photo ID. If we are to rely on a driver's license for
a photo ID, we find that those who do not have a
driver's license are more likely to be elderly,
disabled, poor, a member of a minority community or
have an illness that makes it unsafe to drive.

Also there are many Texas woman who have
both a valid voter registration card and a Texas
driver's license, but the names do not match because
of a recent divorce or marriage. These woman will be
inconvenienced when they attempt to vote, and it is
entirely possible that it could keep some of them away
from the polls.

Currently the Texas on-line poll workers
training can be completed in 60 minutes or less.

Section 3E of this training, qualified voters,
indicates that there are ten possibilities with
instructions on how to handle each one. What would it
take to get this training expanded to include the many
possibilities to look for while determining whether
the photo and accompanying documents meets the photo
ID requirements? The goal must be to provide training
so that reasonable people will come to the same
conclusion when qualifying voters.

Obviously there are costs to Texas in
this bill that are not addressed. Some costs include
issuing photo IDs for those who don't have them,
writing and providing training and making sure that
each citizen knows about these changes. Only
one-third of the counties in Texas have Websites that
can get information to their citizens in this
country -- in their county. I'm sorry.

Voting is the most fundamental
expression of citizenship. Breaking down barriers to
citizen voter participation, from literacy tests to
poll taxes, has been a constant battle for those of
who believe that all citizens should be able to
exercise their right to vote. We support full voter
participation by all eligible Americans, not
restrictions. Thank you for this opportunity to share
our views.
SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Ms. Privett. We appreciate your appearance today. Are there any questions for Ms. Privett?

(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: All right. The Chair hears none.

TESTIMONY BY MARY ANN COLLINS

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair calls Mary Ann Collins. Ms. Collins, you have three minutes. State your name and who you represent.

MS. COLLINS: I'm Mary Ann Collins. I represent myself. I have been an election judge for 27 years and a poll watcher at early voting and the ballot board off and on for years.

In '06 I was a poll watcher at a location in Dallas and just standing there watching, and all of a sudden here comes this lady with purple hair. Needless to say that got my attention, just went on. That afternoon I look around and here comes the purple hair again. I thought "No, that can't be because she's already been through the qualifying table," and that's what I naively thought. It dawned on me later she was voting on somebody else's certificate.

So several days after the whole election
was over, a clerk at that polling place who was there the day that I was called me about a completely unrelated matter, and I said to her "I think there was a lady there who voted twice." She said, "Oh, yes, I know exactly who you mean. I asked her if she hadn't been here before, and she said no."

Now, I will say that after -- I figured out what happened on the day I saw all this. I did call the District Attorney's Office. Of course, it's what we've already said today, it's very hard to prosecute these things because I had no information. I didn't know the lady's name. It didn't dawn on me until too late about what happened.

But my point about all of this is anybody that has got more than one voter registration card, no matter where they got it, could make the rounds of at least six early voting locations in one day in Dallas. So that is where we have a huge problem.

Just one other little sideline that I would like to mention is that I was a poll watcher for the ballot board in Dallas County. This ballot board is chaired by a Democrat. And in order to be a poll watcher on that board, I had to submit a voter registration card and a picture ID. Thank you.
SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Ms. Collins.

Are there any questions of the witness?

(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: All right. The Chair hears none. We appreciate your testimony today.

TESTIMONY BY ROSA ROSALES

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair calls Rosa Rosales of Washington, D.C., the League of United Latin American Citizens. Would you please -- before you begin, you have written testimony. That will be admitted as Exhibit 47.

(Exhibit No. 47 marked and admitted)

MS. ROSALES: Thank you.

SEN. DUNCAN: Hold on just a second.

MS. ROSALES: And I'm from San Antonio, Texas. The main office is in Washington, D.C.

SEN. DUNCAN: And if you could just for the record, state your name and --

MS. ROSALES: My name is Rosa Rosales. I'm the National President of the League of United Latin American Citizens. On behalf of the League of United Latin American Citizens, I thank the Texas State Committee of the Whole for providing me this opportunity to discuss our concerns in opposition to the Texas Senate Bill 362.
We firmly believe that this legislation will disenfranchise thousands of Texas voters, many of them minority and elderly, disabled and women. We also believe that this legislation will have little impact in reducing the alleged in-person voting fraud which the bill is supposed to be designed to prevent.

As made clear by your two-year one point million investigation by the Attorney General Greg Abbott, in-person voting fraud is virtually nonexistent in Texas under existing voter regulation.

My organization advances the economic condition, educational attainment, political influence, health and civil rights of Hispanic Americans to community-based programs operating in more than 700 LULAC councils nationwide, including over 200 here in Texas. Among many other activities, LULAC has sought to help Latinos become citizens and registered to vote. Since our founding in 1929 -- we are 80 years old this year we celebrate -- we have also had to bring the State of Texas to court repeatedly for violating voting rights of Latino citizens within the state. In the vast majority of the states, these cases we have prevailed, costing the state millions of dollars in legal fees that could have been spent on education and other beneficial
programs.

Let me state for the record that if the
Texas Legislature passes and the Governor signs
legislation that is similar in nature to how -- Senate
Bill 362, LULAC will take the State of Texas to court
yet again. We will prevail, and it will cost the
state several million more dollars in legal fees at a
time when Texas taxpayers can least afford it.

The Texas Election Code already requires
the voters -- well, if my time is up, let me just say
that we really feel that this Senate Bill 362 does
discriminate against minorities, particularly Latinos
and blacks and women, disabled, and we strongly urge
to reconsider.

One of the things -- and they said it
before and I'll say it again -- we've come a long ways
from the times they used to say that --

SEN. DUNCAN: Ms. Rosales --

MS. ROSALES: -- no dogs, no Mexicans

and no blacks allowed in restaurants, drinking
fountains and swimming pools. And we just feel this
is another barrier that we do not need. Thank you so
much.

SEN. DUNCAN: Members, are there any
questions of the witness?
(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: Okay. The Chair hears none.

SEN. URESTI: Mr. Chairman?

QUESTIONS FROM SENATE FLOOR

SEN. DUNCAN: Oh, I'm sorry. We do -- Ms. Rosales, we do have a question.

Senator Uresti, you're recognized.

SEN. URESTI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Ms. Rosales. I want to thank you for spending the evening with us, and I also want to thank all of the guests that are here that are either for or against this bill for staying with us and watching the process. And I say that because all of us appreciate this process. And so again, for those that spent the evening with us and that are in the gallery, thank you very much.

Ms. Rosales, I know time is short. I just want to ask a few questions, if I may, to follow up on some of the comments you made earlier. In particular on Page 3 of your brilliant testimony, you mention that as many as 11 percent of the United States citizens, more than 30 million individuals do not have a government-issued photo identification. And you also mention that 18 percent of seniors,
25 percent of African-Americans and 16 percent of Latinos lack a current government-issued photo ID. If you could, could you just expand on that a little bit and why LULAC is taking the position that they are with regard to opposing this bill?

MS. ROSALES: One of the reasons that LULAC is opposing this bill is the fact that we want everyone to have that opportunity to vote. And studies have shown, that our attorneys have looked over, where those figures -- those statistics that you just mentioned aren't true. And if you don't have any kind of an ID, whether it's a driver's license or other identification, you will have problems.

As it is right now, when a lot of Latinos go to vote and even if they have the voter registration, sometimes there's problems with that, and they've been asked "Do you have still live at this address?" The question -- there is some kind of intimidation there, but we strongly feel that it is important that every voter votes, and it's important not to have barriers, you know. We feel that this is just another barrier. Somebody has said it before, it's like bringing back the poll tax. You know, a lot of our elderly don't have that money to go get and pay for that ID.
And also, you know, we talk about this epidemic of voter fraud, and that's one of the reasons for this bill when I've been hearing testimony that it was 192 cases that they found some kind of fraud, and out of the 192 cases only 30 cases were convicted or something like that. To me when millions of Texans have voted, that is not an epidemic.

SEN. URESTI: Very well. Thank you, Ms. Rosales.

SEN. DUNCAN: Members, before we go to the next witness, let me call out another round of cards. And if you'll report to the registration desk then you'll be admitted to the chamber:
Lydia Camarillo; Edward B. Williams, Kilgore;
Madeline Dewar of San Antonio; Helen Villarreal of San Antonio; Roxann Lewis, Galveston County;
Mark Williamson of Katy; Vanessa Edwards Foster of Houston; Luis Figuero of San Antonio; Patti Edelman of Austin; Kenneth Koym of Austin; and Joni Ashbrook of Bastrop; and finally Karen Renick of Austin. Will you please report to the registration desk?
Again, I'm going to make one last call for any persons who would wish to testify. If you're here and you want to testify, please report to the registration desk.
TESTIMONY BY DUSTIN RYNDERS

SEN. DUNCAN: The next -- okay. The next witness is Dustin Rynders of Austin. Please state your name, who you represent. Before you begin, Mr. Rynders has an exhibit, which is his testimony. It will be admitted as Exhibit 48.

(Exhibit No. 48 marked and admitted)

SEN. DUNCAN: You have three minutes.

State your name and who you represent.

MR. RYNDERS: Yes, my name is Dustin Rynders, and I'm an attorney with Advocacy, Incorporated, which is the protection and advocacy system for the State of Texas. We protect the legal rights of people within disabilities within the state. I'm here today testifying not only on behalf of Advocacy, Incorporated, but also on behalf of the Disability Policy Consortium, which is a consortium of over 24 disability rights organizations in the State of Texas.

AI is charged with ensuring individuals with disabilities full participation in the electoral process as a part of the Help America Vote Act. Both AI and the Disability Policy Consortium oppose Senate Bill 362 which burdens Texas voters in our sense because of unnecessary and erroneous voter ID.
restrictions and requirements, risks disenfranchising hundreds of thousands of voters with disabilities and waste resources that could be redirected at other problems facing the state.

We've heard a lot today about differing opinions on what the evidence is of fraud, and my guess is that most of you have made your determinations of what you think that evidence is. I will tell you that in running a voter hotline across the State of Texas, the majority of calls and complaints we receive and the complaints that we've reviewed from the Secretary of State's Office showed that the real problems in elections in Texas still involve poor handling of voter registration, lack of access to absentee ballot applications, voter intimidations, inaccessible polling places, poorly trained poll workers and violations of the right to assistance for people with disabilities.

Texas should address these problems instead of looking at adding barriers to the ballot box, in our view. Texas already has strong criminal laws to deal with any fraud that does occur, and at least 8 percent or 1,270,000 voting age Texans do not have the most common two forms of a photo identification.
Texans with disabilities are among the least likely to have a form of state-issued photo ID because many do not drive. We need photo ID for banking or other activities, which others often assist them with. While Senate Bill 362 allows those with photo -- without photo identification to present two current nonpreferred forms of ID, such as a utility bill or other piece of government mail, this provision does little to expand access in practical terms.

After all, many people with disabilities are less likely to have the numerous forms of nonpreferred identification.

For example, many people with disabilities live with relatives in group homes and nursing homes, don't have utility bills. Even for those who do have two of these documents, many have voted for many years without knowledge of these changing laws. We've heard a lot today about what has been done and what hasn't been done in this bill as far as voter education.

In our experience, training voters with disabilities across the state, written notice is not going to be sufficient. You're going to need the kind of in-person training that Dennis Borel spoke about earlier, and I would trust that you would consider
Also consider the expense. HAVA Funds were used to train voters with disabilities in this state at a cost of $3.5 to $3.6 million each year, more than the Secretary of State has said they currently have left in HAVA Funds.

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr. Rynders. We appreciate your testimony. Is there anyone in the -- any member that would like to ask a question?

(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair hears none.

Thank you for your testimony today.

One of the cards that I think got stuck to another card awhile ago, and this is when we were calling persons down to the front registration desk, I would like to add to the names that we previously called, Sylvia A. Mendoza. Ms. Mendoza, please arrive at the Senate -- at the Senate chamber and the front registration desk, and you'll be admitted to the chamber.

TESTIMONY BY MARSHA CORREIRA

SEN. DUNCAN: The next witness is Marsha Correira. And please forgive me for my tongue not working right then. Please state your name and who you represent. Before you begin, though, let me
introduce your written testimony. Ms. Correira has written testimony, which will be Exhibit 49. It will be in the record.

(Exhibit No. 49 marked and admitted)

SEN. DUNCAN: Okay. Go ahead. You can begin.

MS. CORREIRA: My name is Marsha Correira. I'm from Bastrop County. Greetings to Senator Hegar.

I want to tell you about Mrs. Amanda Jones. Mrs. Amanda Jones of Bastrop County never drove a car, never had a driver's license nor a passport. Mrs. Jones was one of the fortunate ones. She had a large loving family network who took care of her -- who took her to DPS and got her photo identification card. If Mrs. Jones had been without family to help her out and this bill had been in effect last year, she couldn't have cast her last ballot. It was cast by mail, and she died at (crying). I'm sorry.

There are senior citizens all over Texas just like her, and I'm going to be one if I'm not one already. I'm sorry. It's been a long day and a long night.

First of all, I want to say if there's a
criminal out there that's smart enough to get their hands on my voter ID, don't you think -- my voter ID -- my voter certificate, don't you think they'd be clever enough to take my bank statement out of my mailbox or maybe my utility bill? If it's not photo ID, it's not photo ID.

And the purchase of a State of Texas provided ID card and the purchase of the supporting documents to obtain that ID amounts to a fee to vote, a poll tax. The 24th amendment to the U.S. Constitution in 1964 overturned the poll tax. The burden and expense of acquiring these documents would be onerous for some voters, especially for the poor, minority, the very young and senior citizens.

The poll tax was prohibited, but some states continued to assess it. And there was a court case before the Supreme Court, and they said that once the franchise is granted to the electorate, lines which determine who may vote may not be drawn so as to cause invidious discrimination. This would be invidious discrimination.

The interest of the state, the Court said, when it comes to voting registrations is limited to the fixing of standards related to the applicant's qualifications as a voter. In an earlier case, they
said undoubtedly the right of suffrage is a fundamental matter in a free and Democratic society, especially since the right to exercise the franchise in a free and unimpaired manner --

SEN. DUNCAN: Ms. Correira, your time limit is up. I think you have written testimony for us, and I know you didn't get through it, but you need to go this way.

QUESTIONS FROM SENATE FLOOR

SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Chair, I'd like to ask her a question.

SEN. DUNCAN: Sen. Shapleigh?

SEN. SHAPLEIGH: She's been here all night.

MS. CORREIRA: Thank you --

SEN. DUNCAN: Sure.

SEN. SHAPLEIGH: -- and you had to take a little time. Could we finish her statement?

SEN. DUNCAN: Sure. Sen. Shapleigh is recognized to request an extension of the time for the witness.

MS. CORREIRA: Thank you. They said undoubtedly the right of suffrage is a fundamental matter in a free and Democratic society, especially since the right to exercise the franchise (crying) I'm
sorry: I'm sorry -- especially since the right to
exercise the franchise in a free and unimpaired manner
is preservative of our basic civil and political
rights. Any alleged infringement of the right of
citizens to vote must be carefully and meticulously
scrutinized. The Court said, to repeat, "Wealth or
fee paying has, in our view, no relation to voting
qualifications. The right to vote is too fundamental
to be so burdened or so conditioned."

It is obvious that SB 362 is an illegal
attempt at voter suppression and infringement of the
right to vote, and it's unconstitutional. Please vote
against this unconstitutional bill. And I'm really
sorry. I've been here since yesterday at 8:30, and
I'm just exhausted.

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you for your
testimony in front of the Texas Senate. We appreciate
your waiting with us. If we could get her some
assistance, please?

TESTIMONY BY RENE LARA

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair calls Rene Lara.

Please state your name and who you represent. I
believe you have written testimony.

MR. LARA: (Inaudible)

SEN. DUNCAN: Okay. That will be fine.
Thank you. You have three minutes. Thank you.

MR. LARA: Mr. President, Members, this has been a long 24 hours since we registered to testify. It's been a long hearing, and it's been emotional. My name is Rene Lara. I'm with the Texas AFL/CIO here representing over 200,000 members in our state, including refinery workers, teachers, plumbers, nurses, theatrical workers, correctional officers, firefighters, as a way to describe my purpose here today, not to certainly think that this is, you know, testimony that is more valuable than some of the very emotional testimony we've heard already.

Our organization, through the United Labor Legislative Committee, has taken a position opposing Senate Bill 362 for some of the same reasons that you heard yesterday and today, and I'm not going into -- into those issues. In short, for many people we think that this bill makes it more difficult, not easier to vote, and that's the wrong direction to take our democracy, we believe.

There is another issue that we'd like to bring up and concern about the bill. It does require an official ID in order for a person to vote, and among the various forms of identification authorized for voting, the most commonly used and recognized
would be the driver's license or personal ID card issued by the Department of Public Safety. This legislation strongly encourages those without an ID to eventually obtain a state ID if they want to vote, and that, Members of the Legislature, we think would -- in doing so would be taking a big step towards establishing a state ID, and a state ID system is one computer connection away from a national ID system.

Members, the National AFL/CIO and the Republican Party of Texas have a policy/position in common. They both oppose a national ID program and the REAL ID Act. And as you may know, the federal government expects Texas to comply about the REAL ID Act, which envisions that all states be linked through a national database by requiring an official state ID as the most commonly recognized document for voting. We are, in effect, we believe, moving one big step closer towards that national ID system, and that greatly concerns us.

That is my testimony, and I am open to any friendly questions.

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr. Lara. Are there any questions of the witness?

(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: All right. The Chair
hears none. Thank you for your appearance today.

TESTIMONY BY LEE MEDLEY

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair calls Lee Medley. Mr. Medley, please state who you represent --
your name, who you represent, and you have a
three-minute limit.

MR. MEDLEY: My name is Lee Medley. I'm
with the United Steelworkers. I represent the
Steelworkers District Council. I'm a good tax-paying
Texan of which I just paid some taxes. Nobody asked
me for two forms of identification, and of course they
didn't ask me for two forms when I paid my tags or my
hunting license or anything like that.

That's not why I'm here, though, this
morning. Now, I work in a plant. I work on the
Houston Ship Channel, and I'll be back in that plant
probably this weekend. And when the guys and the
women I work with ask me "Well, what are they doing in
Austin?" I'm going to say "Well, they're working on
some mythical twin brother voting conspiracy while our
brothers and sisters in Lone Star, Texas are getting
laid off; while Rockdale, Texas, the Alcoa plant is
being shut down; while Dow Chemical is laying people
off left and right in Freeport," and the best thing we
can figure out to work on is some mythical voter fraud
that still -- I mean, I think I've heard 23 people at the most.

750 people got laid off in Lone Star, Texas two weeks ago. Those are tax-paying citizens. Those are good benefit-bearing jobs. They don't -- excuse me -- they don't care about this. What they're concerned about is putting food on the table for their families. That's what you-all are elected to do, is represent those people, not political parties, not playing these games, it's to represent working families in the State of Texas. That's why you're here. That's what I want to go back and tell my brothers and sisters at my plant, that they're working hard for you and your family, but right now I don't think I could say that.

And that's my testimony. I will tell you right now Rome burns, the Senate is fiddling. Thank you.

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr. Medley, for your testimony. Are there any questions?

(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: All right. The Chair hears none.

TESTIMONY BY JOHN WATKINS

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair calls John
Watkins. Mr. Watkins?

MR. WATKINS: Hello. My name is John Watkins. I'm from Wells Point, Texas. I appreciate the opportunity, Mr. President and Senators, to speak before you.

On this bill that's before us, the Senate 362, I have worked -- my background is I have worked as an alternate judge, as a clerk and a Spanish language translator. I see very little difference between present practice and what we're doing and what is offered in this bill as far as a photo ID. This bill does not require a photo ID. It makes it a first choice.

The big difference I see in this bill and present practice is in the certificate. When someone comes to us presently using no certificate, we look them up on the rolls. We check a block on the sheet stating that they did not have or did not present a certificate so that they'll get mailed a new one presumably. And then after verifying with some ID that was approved already by the state, and there's various ones, then we verify them, and we get them to vote.

And this bill, by requiring -- from the way I read the bill, it requires them to have in their
hand that certificate. And I believe Ms. Huffman --
or no -- well, it was Sen. Fraser and another Senator
from this side, which I couldn't see from where I was
at in the balcony, and they had an exchange about a
2fer or a 3fer, and that is pertinent because that's
the key issue here.

Probably 30 percent of the people that I
meet when I'm working in the poll do not have their
certificates with them, and it's not just minorities,
it's everybody. So that's one reason that I'm --
unfortunately I'd like to say yes, vote for this bill,
but personally I cannot do that because of that
particular issue. And hopefully those two Senators
will work that out because we do need some sort of
control in the polls to avoid it, to avoid fraud.
Thank you.

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr. Watkins.
Are there any questions of the witness?
(No response)
SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair hears none.
Thank you for your appearance today in the Texas
Senate.

TESTIMONY BY KENNETH FLIPPIN

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair calls Kenneth
Flippin. Mr. Flippin, state your name and who you
represent, and you have three minutes, please.

MR. FLIPPIN: Thank you. My name is Ken Flippin. I represent myself. I'm from all over Texas. I'm a native Texan, but I've lived in at least seven of your districts throughout my life. I'm a community organizer, and I've worked in politics since I was about 16 years old. So I know you-all have been hearing a lot of different arguments over the last day.

And so I guess I'm going to make more of a political appeal and say, you know, as we think about the campaign process, the political process, this process, it's all really the same, it's a Democratic process. It's our effort to make our union a little bit more perfect. And I believe that Senators on both sides really do want to make our union more perfect.

And the question really isn't whether or not we're trying to find just the right balance. The question is is this something that's going to make our union more perfect, or is it going to be something that's going to disenfranchise more voters than we end up getting out of the system that shouldn't be there?

I think that most of us that have worked in campaigns know that it takes a lot of work to get
people that are eligible citizens to get registered, to get involved, to get educated, to get to the polls, and it's even more effort to get somebody obviously who is not a citizen or somebody that wants to vote to get them to vote twice. In fact it's a ludicrous thing that a campaign would try to do, and I'm sure none of you have tried to do that. And why would you? And that's why it's so rare because it's not the objective of a campaign. The objective is to get people out to vote because you're the best person for the job.

And I dare say that as good a campaign manager I might be or as great a politician that some of you may be that have run and will run again, the fact is no matter how great you are, you're probably not going to persuade too many people to break the law and vote for you twice or to vote for you when it's not legal.

And the reality is we can as a state vote to maintain the integrity of the ballot by doing other things that can solve the problems that you're concerned about, but more importantly we can keep from disenfranchising voters.

I think what you're fearing by proposing this bill is really a problem that barely exists, if
at all, but the problem that you're going to create is
bigger than the problem you see existing. One thing I
know is that if you want to get people organized and
excited, disenfranchise them. Whether it's the
private school kids that their IDs don't count or it's
that elderly lady that maybe she does have the
documents at home, but she forgets them and when she
gets to the poll there's not enough time for her son
who brought her to get her back. Those are the folks
you'll get organized.

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr. Flippin.

Are there any questions for Mr. Flippin?

(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: We appreciate your
testimony today.

TESTIMONY BY ANNIE BANKS

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair calls Annie
Banks. Ms. Banks, you have three minutes, please.

And would you please state your name and who you
represent?

MS. BANKS: My name is Annie Banks, and
I represent the Texas Alliance for Retired Americas.
I am the President of the Texas Alliance for Retired
Americas, and I'm here to say that we are voting
against this. We have 86,000 members thus far. We do
educate our members. Every Friday they have a Friday alert, and we do send out by snail mail any information that they want to know about.

And our seniors are really having a hard time. Their hurdles are many, and their hurdles entail their healthcare, their prescription drugs and all of these things, and you've just give us another piece of paper or something else to deal with. But when you get over 65, you'll understand a whole lot of things by then, but I just want to say thank you for allowing me to say that we are here. And if we can help, let us know. Thank you.

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Ms. Banks. Are there any questions for Ms. Banks?

(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair hears none, and we appreciate your appearance today.

TESTIMONY BY RACHEL HERNANDEZ

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair calls Rachel Hernandez. Ms. Hernandez, state your name, please, and who you represent. Before you do that, though, you have an exhibit. You have your written testimony, which will be admitted into the record as Exhibit 50. Okay. You can begin.

(Exhibit No. 50 marked and admitted)
MS. HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Thank you very much for allowing me to speak today. My name is Rachel Hernandez, and I'm a service coordinator with Granada Homes in San Antonio, Texas. Granada Homes is an apartment complex for senior citizens ages 62 and older. It's an independent living facility. We don't have any nursing facilities at our location. We're located in downtown San Antonio, and because of the parking situation, 99 percent of our residents have no vehicles or use public transportation to get around or their families.

My job as a service coordinator is to help our residents and any issues that would normally be taken care of by their children or by another loved one, and that would be anything from reading their mail to checking their bank statements to making sure that their needs are met, whether by a provider or other services.

One of the things that I've experienced as a service coordinator with senior citizens is that obtaining documents that are necessary for what we would consider daily needs become much more difficult. They have more difficulty getting to their locations or taking the bus, and something like this bill would not be a positive direction on their behalf. They're
very proud people. They vote. In fact we make sure
that we take them to vote, and it's something they
look forward to. Adding another obstacle to getting
them in a vehicle to getting them to a polling place
and then requiring something additional that they may
have forgotten only gives them a deterrent to wanting
to do it again. Whether they present identification
or not, this Bill S-362 would have an adverse impact
on the senior community.

And in closing, I believe that no
legislation should be allowed or supported if the end
result is a stifling of the voice of any American and
their constitutional right to vote. Thank you.

SEN. DUNCAN: Members, are there any
questions of Ms. Hernandez?

(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair hears none.

Thank you for your appearance today.

TESTIMONY BY RENATO DE LOS SANTOS

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair calls Renato de
los Santos.

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Good morning,
Mr. President and Honorable Members of the Senate. I
live in the 23rd Senatorial District and have the
privilege of serving as the Director of the LULAC
National Education Service Center, an educational nonprofit agency based in the Oak Cliff section of Dallas.

As director of the LULAC, I have the privilege of working on a daily basis with some of the neediest families in the D/FW Metroplex, families who are daily forced to make choices between buying food for their families or gas for their vehicles or perhaps paying for a traffic fine or replacing a lost or stolen ID or driver's license.

Given the new regulations that are being enforced in Dallas and I believe the rest of the state that deny a renewal of an ID or a driver's license for those who have outstanding traffic fines or tickets, I believe that we are setting a dangerous precedent by potentially disenfranchising people many times who are very fragile voters who need a small incentive like this or a disincentive to discourage them from voting.

However, this morning I am here not to talk about these people, but because of my own family and the tragedy that happened a few years ago. My mother died in 1992 in Corpus Christi after a year and a half of a battle with bone cancer. As part of that, she found herself in M.D. Anderson Hospital in Houston, Texas. Shortly before -- immediately before
the elections in 1992 she returned to Corpus Christi
for Hospice care, and she died December 1st of that
year.

One of the biggest privileges and one of
the few joys that she had was she had lasted until
that time to vote in that election. It was a major
point. I talked to my sister this morning -- or last
night rather, and she was telling me she remembered
clearly having taken my mother to vote.

And what really made it special was
that -- unfortunately when we returned from M.D.
Anderson, my mother's house had been burglarized.
Things had been taken we couldn't believe that they
would want, but amongst the things were all of her
IDs, the birth certificates, records. We don't have
anything left of what my mother -- the legacy of my
mom there, but because she was known to the voter --
to the precinct people there, she was allowed to vote,
but only because she was known to them personally
because she didn't have any ID that could have proven
who she was. And if this law had been in place then,
she would have been disenfranchised, and it would have
taken a last bit of joy that we celebrated as a family
that she got to vote in that election.

Please do not disenfranchise people.
Please do not vote for -- for this bill.

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you for your testimony. Is there anyone who would wish to question Mr. de los Santos?

(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr. de los Santos. We appreciate your appearance here today.

Before we call the next witness, I want to go ahead and make one last call, and we normally say this in all of our committee meetings. Are there -- is there anyone else who would wish to testify for, against or on Senate Bill 362? And the reason I'm making that call right now is we have about 13 or 14 more witnesses left, and it will take about 30 minutes, and we've given the witnesses 30 minutes to report to the desk. So if you will -- this is the last call for any additional witnesses to appear before the committee.

The next witness -- and this was made at 8:10. So that will be -- 8:40 would be the cutoff deadline for those in the front.

The next witness is Judy Holloway.

Ms. Holloway, please state your name, who you represent.
MS. HOLLOWAY: My name is Judy Holloway. I live in Lake Travis -- around Lake Travis, and I represent myself. I was a poll watcher during the last Presidential Election. On October 13th past the deadline for voter registration, I had an occasion to visit the Travis County Voter Registration Department. As it happened, a reporter was there interviewing a spokeswoman -- I'll settle down in a second -- for the department regarding the number of registered voters in Travis County. She told the reporter the total number of voters was 531,000. She also said that there were -- that there were an additional 800 applications received in the mail that would not be counted because they were postmarked after the deadline. They could not be counted because the deadline had passed.

On November 4th, I logged on to the Travis County Website and discovered a letter from Nelda Wells Spears that said Travis County had a total of 611,024 registered voters, a record, "It was a record breaking number." Based on the official number used for the voting age population, the 2000 census data, the registration rate was 98 percent. I had to pick my mouth -- I had to pick my mouth up off the
floor -- kind of like now. That number, 611,024, was
80,000 votes -- voters more than what was supposed to
be the final count.

I also had the opportunity to talk with
several employees at the registration offices. They
told me that 95 percent of the employees during the
Presidential Election who were processing the
applications were temporary workers. When asked if
all the information on the voters' applications had
been verified, the answer was no. I was told that
every applicant signs an affidavit, and that was proof
enough to obtain a voter registration card. How does
that prove anything?

Just this past week I talked with
someone else who was a supervisor with Travis
County -- Travis County voter registration. I asked
her if all applications were verified. She said no.
Who were these additional people who voted last fall?
I don't know. Do you? The truth is we don't know,
but what we do know is that we can't have dead people
voting in our elections, we can't have noncitizens
voting in our elections, we can't have felons voting
in our elections.

The only way we're going to know who is
voting in our elections is to be able to verify that
the person who is voting is who they say they are. And the best way to do that is to require photo identification. Please help us to ensure the integrity of our voting process. This isn't about suppression. This is about protection.

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Ms. Holloway. We appreciate your testimony. Are there any questions for Ms. Holloway?

(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair hears none. We appreciate you being here in the Texas Senate.

TESTIMONY BY LYDIA CAMARILLO

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair calls Lydia Camarillo. Ms. Camarillo, please state your name and who you represent, and we have a three-minute limit.

MS. CAMARILLO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SEN. DUNCAN: Just a minute. I'm sorry to interrupt you. We have an exhibit for Ms. Holloway, and we need to get that in the record. So Ms. Holloway's exhibit is a Travis County Voter Registrar document, Exhibit 51.

(Exhibit No. 51 marked and admitted)

SEN. DUNCAN: Then Ms. Camarillo has a witness -- or has an exhibit as well, and it will be entered into the record as Exhibit No. 52.
(Exhibit No. 52 marked and admitted)

SEN. DUNCAN: All right. Finally here we go. You can begin, Ms. Camarillo.

MS. CAMARILLO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Buenos dias, Senators. I am Lydia Camarillo, Vice-President of Southwest Voter Registration Education Project, the largest and oldest nonpartisan, nonprofit organization of its kind with a simple mission, to increase the number of Latino and other ethnic communities who are registered to vote and participate in America's democracy as full and equal partners.

Founded in San Antonio Texas by the late William C. Velasquez, Southwest Voter has registered over 2.3 million Latino voters throughout Texas, the Southwest and since 2000 the Southeast including Florida. Southwest Voter has won over 80 voting rights lawsuits and has prepared over 100,000 leaders to organize their communities.

In Gonzalez vs. Arizona, MALDEF challenges in federal court the voter registration and identification provisions of Arizona Proposition 200. Southwest Voter is a plaintiff for that case as in the case for the Florida case against a similar issue on the voter ID.
I am here to advise you of Southwest Voters' strong opposition to SB 362. Southwest Voter opposes this bill because it would have a negative impact on the Latino voter registration and potentially violate election laws, including the Voting Rights Act, the National Voting Right Registration Act and the Help America Vote Act that everybody has talked about this last 24 hours, HAVA. This bill will only serve to depress voter registration of Latinos, other ethnic communities and the poor. For these reasons, Southwest Voter opposes SB 362 and urges your opposition.

Texas Legislators must take affirmative steps to promote the participation of American citizens voting and participating in America's democracy and should, in its wisdom, oppose the legislation that only serves to confuse citizens, contradict federal law, create undue financial burden to the poor, Latinos, African-American citizens who want to register and to vote.

And finally, it will create a financial burden to Texas counties and taxpayers. SB 326 is a bill that creates redundancy and multiple identification requirements for voters. Southwest Voter believes that Texas law provides for proof of
identification, and this bill will only create confusion. It will create more burdensome voting experiences for both the voter and the polling worker.

Texas law requires that voter registration applicants must affirmatively mark their U.S. citizenship under penalty of perjury and submit their affidavit application, either in person or by the post card, according to the election code, Section 13.121.

In our experience of 35 years, we find that people do not carry their passports or any identification in many cases, or they have lost them, and this may cause disenfranchisement.

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Ms. Camarillo. Your time has expired. Let me ask if there are any questions of the witness.

(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: All right. The Chair hears none. We do have your -- I think your written testimony in the record. We appreciate your appearance here today.

MS. CAMARILLO: Thank you.

TESTIMONY BY EDWARD B. WILLIAMS

SEN. DUNCAN: All right. The Chair recognizes Edward B. Williams. Mr. Williams, please
state your name and who you represent. You have a
three-minute time limit.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
My name is Edward Williams. I'm from Kilgore, Texas,
and I represent the interest of Edward Smith deceased.
To begin with, I would like to thank
those of you Senators who are troopers and stayed with
us, and I appreciate the time that you've put forth
and the respect that you're showing by being here on
the Senate floor today.
I also want to make a comment to the Tax
Assessor's Office in Harris County. If more tax
assessors and voter registrar's took their jobs as
seriously as they do in Harris County, we would not
have the voter fraud problems throughout the state
that we do.
I'd like to take you back about 14 hours
to our first witness. And I'm from Harrison County,
which is -- Marshall is the county seat. He referred
to Harrison County or the Harrison County method as
being a notorious term to represent voter fraud that
occurs within the State of Texas.
My grandfather, Edward Smith, died
in 1935. My mother was just a child, two or three
years old. In 1989 he received a jury summons. My
grandmother was a little bit bewildered that he had received his jury summons, and we called the District Clerk's Office to notify him that he had passed away in 1935. They informed us that he had been voting regularly in person in the last -- in all of the elections since 1935. It was not until 1994 that he stopped voting. And in 1995 we removed the house from the property that he was registered to vote at. My grandfather died in '35. He voted for 59 years after his death in person, either on election day or during early voting.

I hope that each of you will consider this, the testimony that's come before in regards to identity theft or the use of voter registration cards by the deceased, and I hope that you will vote in support of Senate Bill 362. Thank you.

SEN. DUNCAN: Members, are there any questions of the witness?

(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr. Williams.

It's good to see you.

TESTIMONY BY MADELEINE DEWAR

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair recognizes Madeleine Dewar. Ms. Dewar, you have three minutes.

Please state your name and who you represent.
MS. DEWAR: My name is Madeline Dewar, and I represent myself. I'm also a member of Bexar County Democratic Women and San Antonio Area Progressive Action Coalition.

I live in a working class barrio in San Antonio. Many of my neighbors work two and sometimes three jobs. Others are elderly on a very limited income. Even if the photo ID were available for free, the documents required to obtain those IDs are not. If you have to choose between food for your children or medicines for yourself, obtaining birth certificates or other documents would not be a priority. Taking time off from work from a minimum wage hourly worker's job is often not feasible.

Some of you may consider obtaining a driver's license or Texas ID a simple matter. For the poor and many elderly, it can be a complex, time consuming and relatively costly process.

By the way, for a number of reasons, my own 38-year old Caucasian son does not have a driver's license, nor does he have access to any of the alternatives mentioned today except for his birth certificate and his voter registration card. He would no longer be able to vote.

If we had evidence of tens or thousands
or even hundreds of fraudulent voters that would be
resolved by this bill, I would be standing here
working very hard to answer — for an answer to ensure
ballot integrity, but it has been clearly shown that
there is no voter fraud in Texas that would be
eliminated by SB 362 despite the inappropriate use of
a portion of taxpayer dollars designated for major
crimes that was diverted to investigate and search out
alleged voter fraud.

This bill clearly is not intended to
reduce nonexistent voter fraud. Sen. Fraser
repeatedly referred to an increase in Democratic votes
in Indiana and Georgia, but failed to mention that
those increases were present across the country and
inarguably attributed to Barack Obama and the overall
2008 political environment.

This bill is a blatant partisan effort
to disenfranchise minorities, the elderly and the poor
of Texas with a backdoor poll tax. This bill's
political direction — this bill is — real intent is
to suppress the Democratic votes in order to stem the
political direction of the great State of Texas. I'm
here to ask every single Senator present this morning
look in your hearts and do the right thing for the
many voters of Texas who are less fortunate than
themselves. Thank you.

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Ms. Dewar. Are there any questions for Ms. Dewar?

(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair sees or hears none. Thank you for your appearance today.

TESTIMONY BY HELEN VILLARREAL

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair calls Helen Villarreal. Ms. Villarreal, would you state your name and who you represent, and please observe the three-minute time limit?

MS. VILLARREAL: Good morning, Members of the Senate, Citizens of Texas. My name is Helen Villarreal, and I am here to represent myself. I'm going to talk quickly about three items.

Number one, my mother. My mother is 85 years old. She's lucky she's healthy. She's got her voter ID. She's got her voter certification, but not all senior citizens in Texas are as lucky as she is, and that's the ones I'm worried about. Some of them don't have sons or daughters that live in the same city or near their parents. Some live in other states, maybe in other countries. Some of these elderly citizens live at home alone, and getting extra documents or certification is hard for them.
financially and also physically. Say they have to get the bus an hour and a half to go one way and an hour and a half to come back. If you've ever been in San Antonio via bus, you'll know. And it's dangerous. It's plain dangerous for some of them to go somewhere alone to get this document.

Also, now I want to talk -- and my mother is not irresponsible. She's been responsible all of her life.

My husband recently -- about a year ago I went and got his birth certificate because we might travel someday. There were three errors on it, his last name -- our last name has two "r's." Sometimes Villarreal is spelled with one "r," and ours is spelled two "r's," and it only had one "r" on the birth certificate. They messed up his mother's maiden name, and there was one other error.

My husband did not vote in the -- the last time he voted was in the 2000 election, and he will not vote again because he thinks the system is all messed up. If I should tell him "Well, you know, go vote," and they say "Well, you've only got one 'r' there, oh, it will be counted provisionally," that's going to turn him off.

Thirdly, this SB 362 might cause lines.
There's important elections, and they're just having
to check one document. Can you imagine if they're
checking two? The line is going to back up. Anyway,
that might discourage people, and they might just get
out of line and turn away.

So that is why I am against Senate
Bill 362. Thank you.

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Ms. Villarreal.

Are there any questions for the witness?

(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: Okay. The Chair hears
none. Thank you for your appearance today.

Members, for the record, we -- in
response to a call, we have the card for Duane Rawson,
and he, I think, is in the back -- in the back haul --
or the front haul rather.

TESTIMONY BY MARK WILLIAMSON

SEN. DUNCAN: The next witness is
Helen -- or I'm sorry -- Mark Williamson.

Mr. Williamson, please state your name and who you
represent, and please observe the three-minute time
limit.

MR. WILLIAMSON: I'm Mark Williamson,
the founder of Federal Intercessors. I'm honored to
be here and to testify on behalf of the voter ID bill.
I'm a minister and approach this perhaps differently than most. I feel it is imperative to pass this legislation as weak as it is and as limited as it is. It is time to secure the vote.

The Biblical command to do everything decently and in order is not just a rule for churches, it is a life principle, and it is particularly applicable to civil government and its processes. Roman's 13 says that "Civil rulers" -- and that includes you senators -- "are the ministers of God to reward good and punish evil." You are stewards before God with the great weight of responsibility that you will answer for. Do not take it lightly. Do not reduce it to cheap political advantage. God is a God of standards and boundaries from Mt. Sinai to the borders of nations and the boundaries of one man/one woman marriage and even salvation.

One standard universally applied, is a photo ID really such an unbearable burden when one can't effectively function in our modern society without it? This is not even a serious question.

The Bible also states that "Whoever resists the ordinance of God will bring judgment on themselves," and that's whether you're a citizen or a ruler. God hates unjust weights and measures. That
is the lack of integrity. That means he is for a
single universally applied standard equal for and
protective of everyone, not just your constituents.
I say again, secure the vote.

Mexico is in danger of imploding. Our
borders are porous, and ACORN is increasingly seeking
to do their mischief in Texas. They would see the
failure of this bill as a green light, and we all know
it.

The last line of defense is to secure
the vote. If we can send men and woman to fight and
die in Iraq to secure their vote, I don't think a
photo ID is too much to ask to secure ours.

If I for whatever reason were unable to
produce my driver's license at the polling booth, I
would gladly sacrifice my vote to be confident that
the electoral process was sound and secure, no matter
the outcome. One vote per one legal citizen.

I say again, secure the vote, for my
right to vote means not much if there's no integrity
in the system. Thank you very much. God bless you
all, and God bless Texas.

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr. Williamson.
Are there any questions for Mr. Williamson? You need
to go to the right.
(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair hears no questions of -- thank you for your appearance today.

TESTIMONY BY VANESSA FOSTER

SEN. DUNCAN: The next witness is Vanessa Edwards Foster. Ms. Foster, please approach and state your name and who you represent, and please observe the three-minute time limit.

MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Mr. President.

My name is Vanessa Edwards Foster, and I am representing the Texas Gender Advocacy and Information Network. And typically I don't do this, but I am a transsexual. I understand a couple of you have mentioned the sex change issue and had a little bit of fun with it a couple of times.

I want to tell you about my personal story with regards to this. In 1996 I found out exactly what it's like not to be able to vote. I went to vote for the Presidential Election, and at that point in time, I did not have my name and gender change to my current presentation. I had my male voter certificate and my male driver's license. I went in and I presented my certificate. The lady took one look at that, took a look at the name, took a look at me and said "Do you have some identification or
something?"

I showed her my identity, and I explained to her exactly what the situation was. And she took a look at that and took a look at me and said "No, this does not look like you." This is my identity, and yet even though I'm presenting my legal identity, I did not have the right to vote.

Now, I was a little bit timid at that time, and I went ahead and walked away. There were people in back of me, so I didn't want to draw a scene. I'm not so timid any more.

And one of the things that I do know is that we've been trying here in the State of Texas to get uniformity and some kind of clarity with regards to name and gender changes the way they have in other states where you basically present a letter to the DPS and you get the name and gender change on your ID. We've been trying for this well over a decade. As Sen. Shapiro mentioned, identity matters. And, yes, it does matter, it's mattered to us for quite a number of years. In fact, she said "We're just trying to make sure that everyone's ID matches who they are."

Well, that's exactly what we wanted, and we have been trying for that for over a decade and have not an been able to achieve that yet, and we
still have that bill pending right now as we speak. I don't know that it will pass, and I certainly don't know that it will pass before this passes. But the one thing that I can guarantee you, I've got two friends of mine in Houston right now, they have transitioned, they are living as female, but their presentation does not match their ID per court decree. Both of them right now are going through divorces, and per their Judge's decree, they must remain in their current gender and their current name until their divorce is final.

Now, if this means that they have no opportunity to vote, I have let them know that they are being disenfranchised and prepare to file a federal lawsuit. And indeed, Senator Fraser, you will be popular.

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Ms. Foster. Members -- you need to go to the right. Are there any questions for the witness? (No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair hears none. Thank you for your appearance.

TESTIMONY BY LUIS FIGUERO

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair calls Luis Figuero. Mr. Figuero has written testimony that he
would like to enter into the record as Exhibit 53.

(Exhibit No. 53 marked and admitted)

SEN. DUNCAN: Mr. Figuero, go ahead and
state your name, who you represent, and please observe
the three-minute time limit.

MR. FIGUERO: Thank you, Chairman
Duncan, Members of the Senate. I am Luis Figuero, a
Legislative Staff Attorney for the Mexican-American
Legal Defense and Educational Defense Fund, a
nonpartisan legal voting rights -- legal organization
founded in Texas in 1968 to protect and defend Latino
civil rights, including voting rights.

We recognize the Senate today as trying
to find that balance between security and access. It
is extremely important in the issue of voting rights.
We believe that Senate Bill 362 swings the pendulum
too far and risk potential disenfranchisement by
creating more harms than benefits that will be
achieved.

The best information we have about the
impact of voter identification laws comes from
litigation which MALDEF represents eligible voters who
are turned away from the polls as well as voter
organizations. These cases include Gonzalez vs.
Arizona in which MALDEF attorneys served as lead
counsel for the plaintiffs.

Importantly, at the trial of this case, Arizona could not produce any example of impersonation of voter fraud to justify its voter ID law. The lack of evidence or even a single incident of impersonation voter fraud is consistent with the U.S. Supreme Court's observation in the Indiana voter ID case, that the record contains no evidence of any such fraud actually occurring in Indiana at any time in history. And that is actually in the opinion in Crawford vs. Marion County Elections Board.

In Arizona across three federal elections, 4,194 voters cast conditional provisional ballots that were never counted because the voter could not provide the required ID. In Texas 42,000 provisional ballots were cast in the 2008 General Election, but only 9,444 were counted. We can only imagine that the numbers would rise by increasing the ID requirements.

The examples of disenfranchisement in Arizona include Karen Lewsader, a police officer and registered Republican, who was forced to cast a conditional provisional ballot because her driver's license listed a different address than the voter rolls. Ms. Lewsader, while she was at the poll, went
back to her car to try to find another form of identification with the correct name and address so she could cast a regular ballot, but the vehicle registration information she found was under her husband's name. When the demands of her job prevented her from returning to the county to show additional ID, her vote was not counted.

Georgia Morrison-Flores was a newlywed when she registered to vote, and she registered under a married name. However, when she went to vote, her maiden name on her driver's license did not match her married name in which she was registered. Because the names did not match, even though her valid ID showed her birth, photo and first name, she was turned away by an election poll worker who had been her childhood neighbor, and she was unable to cast a ballot of any kind despite her status as a qualified voter.

So for these reasons, we find it disheartening and such a restrictive government response to an unproven problem of potential voter fraud, and we ask and we urge this committee to reject the voter identification provisions of Senate Bill 362. And we're open for any questions or concerns that may be from the Senate regarding this legislature or our litigation in Arizona or in Texas.
Thank you very much.

SEN. DUNCAN: Members, you've heard the testimony. Do you have any questions of the witness?

(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you for your appearance today.

SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Mr. Chair?

QUESTIONS FROM SENATE FLOOR

SEN. DUNCAN: Oh, I'm sorry. Excuse me. Sen. Shapleigh?

SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Can we just mark this as an exhibit and make it part of the record? Is it already admitted?

SEN. DUNCAN: I think -- have we not done that? We've already admitted that, Senator.

SEN. SHAPLEIGH: Thank you.

SEN. DUNCAN: Yes, sir. Thank you.

TESTIMONY BY PATTI EDELMAN

SEN. DUNCAN: Patti Edelman?

Ms. Edelman --

MS. EDELMAN: Thank you.

SEN. DUNCAN: -- name and address -- or name and who you represent, and please observe the time limit.

MS. EDELMAN: My name is Patti Edelman,
and I'm a resident of Austin, Texas. I'm here representing myself. Mr. President and Senators, thank you for the opportunity to speak today. It looks like we've been here so long that I'm about ready to join AARP.

I have an elderly mother that lives in East Texas, and as a lot of people have stated, it would be a hardship for her to have to produce a driver's license or some other form of picture ID. At her age, she doesn't get out much, and she certainly hasn't driven in years, and I know the drivers in her community are thankful for that.

Having been an Election Official and a poll worker here in Travis County, I can assure you that no dead people have come to vote at the precincts where I have worked. Nothing is more sacred to Americans than the right to vote, and I believe it is the responsibility of all citizens to vote.

This bill does not address voters who use mail ballots to vote in Texas, but are not -- not residents of Texas and, in fact, have voted in more than one state, such as a number of Republicans in Polk County who are members of a group called The Escapees.

Lastly, I ask that -- oh, I want to
state that anyone who has run a campaign, especially
like you, Lieutenant Governor Dewhurst, that's run a
statewide campaign, knows the expense of putting out
information to voters in multiple media markets in a
state the size of ours. And the cost that will be
borne by the citizens of the State of Texas in order
to educate the voters of this state to the changes and
the requirements in order for them to do what they've
been able to do very easily and freely for a long
time, it's a shame that we would be spending our
hard-earned tax dollars on such -- I won't call it
frivolous, but I think quite unnecessary expenditure
at this point in time.

We have lots of other budget -- budget
problems, many constraints, a lot of people hurting,
and to use our tax dollars in this manner I find is
unconscionable. Thank you.

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you for your
testimony. Hold on. Are there any questions of the
witness?

(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair hears none.

Thank you for your appearance today.

TESTIMONY BY SYLVIA MENDOZA

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair calls Sylvia
Mendoza. Ms. Mendoza, please state your name and who you represent, and please observe the three-minute time limit.

MS. MENDOZA: My name is Sylvia Mendoza, and I represent myself. Do you know what the definition of "illegal" is? It is "banned, forbidden, prohibited, unlawful, not legal, wrong, unjust and unconstitutional." Even though it is unconstitutional, voter fraud has been committed. One reason there may not be too many documented cases of voter fraud is because exactly that, it was fraud, some got away with it.

I'm a 54-year-old third generation American. I've had a social security card since about the age of 14, but you see, one of these is a fake, yet they all look the same. It was easy to acquire and it is accepted as valid. That means there could be a traitor somewhere.

Right now it is almost as easy to sometimes get by without having the legal right to vote. A lot of people voted this Presidential Election, people who had never voted before. Yes, I know a lot of people voted for the reason of who we would be voting for. Some of those people did not honor and respect the right to vote before. They
didn't love America until now. What a shame.

I feel now is the time for voter ID to prepare for the future. If you do it now -- if you don't do it now, you will be voting for it later.

You-all have a duty to us citizens as lawmakers, so do your job and make this a deterrent to prepare and to make it nearly impossible for voter fraud. Anyone who votes against it is not doing everything within their power for this great state within this great country. Vote for voter ID, SB 362.

On the national level, the government says the system is broken on certain aspects of it. Do not make the same mistake. Pass Senate Bill 362.

Thank you.

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you. Members, are there any questions of Ms. Mendoza?

(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair hears none.

Thank you for your appearance today. You had an exhibit. She does have an exhibit, or she has -- she wants to put her testimony in. We'll mark that as Exhibit 54, Ms. Mendoza's statement or testimony.

(Exhibit No. 54 marked and admitted)

TESTIMONY BY KENNETH KOYM

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair calls Kenneth
Mr. Koym, state your name, who you represent, and please observe the three-minute time limit.

MR. KOYM: Creating barriers and hate crime is not the part of a Texas Legislature. It should not be done. Passing SB 362 is a hate crime, and I urge that you get honest, very honest with yourselves.

My name is Kenneth Koym. I'm a psychotherapist, and I am licensed by this state. I'm licensed by other countries. It is irrational to do what this Senate is talking about doing. I do not accept it. It is unbecoming, Tommy, for you to call somebody a political --

SEN. DUNCAN: I'm sorry, sir, you addressed a Senator by his formal name. And also if you could -- I understand your passion for the issue, but please observe the decorum of the Senate. You can have an extension of about -- well, you're running okay. We'll give you a little bit more over your time limit.

MR. KOYM: I have served the United States professionally. I'm a military research scientist retired. I'm a marriage and family therapist. I feel that it is time that every law comes under the task of the Hate Crimes Act of the
United States. It is a federal law, and I urge that this bill be reviewed in that term. It is absolutely the requirement of this nation to stop all this hate.

I saw it here. I had my white cap on to keep me warm through the night. I froze, and I feel cold despair. I feel the despair, though, that the U.S. citizens are feeling with regard to more and more hate crimes. And this -- this Senate should not pass this bill and pass -- and commit a hate crime. It is dishonorable, it is un-American, and I urge that it not happen. Please vote against this bill.

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr. Koym. Are there any questions of the witness?

(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair hears none.

Thank you for your appearance here today.

MR. KOYM: I will (inaudible) by mail.

SEN. DUNCAN: You can send it to the Secretary of the Senate. It will not be in the record.

MR. KOYM: Fine.

TESTIMONY BY KAREN RENICK

SEN. DUNCAN: All right. Ms. Karen Renick? Ms. Renick, please state your name and who you represent, and please observe the three-minute
time limit.

MS. RENICK: My name is Karen Renick. I am the founder and current Director of Vote Rescue, a nonpartisan citizens' group based here in Austin. We are concerned with election integrity and transparency.

Since early 2005 we've been alerting the public and our government officials about the serious assault on our voting rights by the total absence of both integrity and transparency in the voting process used throughout Texas today.

Before I continue with my contents -- comments specific to SB 362, I feel compelled to first set the record straight about the infamous misdeeds in a certain Senate Primary Election here in Texas 61 years ago in 1948. I feel compelled because these misdeeds have been incorrectly used as an example of voter fraud when, in fact, it was clearly election fraud committed by Election Officials, not voters.

The Senate Primary race was between Lyndon Johnson and Coke Stevenson, who was a popular conservative governor. I'd like to read now from the book called Steal This Vote, Dirty Elections and the Rotten History of Democracy in American, written by the well-known journalist Andrew Gumbel.
"On election night, Stevenson was ahead by 854. The following night Johnson made up almost all the difference thanks to late-breaking returns from Houston and one precinct in Duval County. Four days after the election, though, Stevenson was up again by a seemingly insurmountable 362. After six days with nothing obvious left to count, Stevenson was still leading by 113. Johnson needed a miracle and got one courtesy of an election enforcer by the name of Luis Salas in Jim Wells County, one county over from Duval."

"At the 13th precinct in Alice, the Jim Wells County Seat, Salas artfully had a seven in one of the vote totals changed into a nine by the addition of a simple loop giving Johnson an extra 200 votes and with them the election. Stevenson traveled down to Alice, examined the electoral register and noticed that at least -- or that the last 200 names appeared in strict alphabetical order and were written in a different color ink from the rest."

"Legal challenges continued for a while, but increasingly frustrated Stevenson then sued to have the ballot boxes opened and the votes examined and recounted, but in the absence of concrete proof of fraud, he could not make up the case -- make the case.
When even the Supreme Court refused to hear him, he gave up for good, and the rest is history."

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Ms. Renick.

Members, are there any questions for Ms. Renick?

(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair hears none. We appreciate your appearance here today.

Members, just out of an abundance of caution, I'm going to make one last call for a Roxann Lewis. I think we called her earlier, but if she is in the building, she needs to report immediately. And if she does not report before we close or hear the last witness, then she'll miss her opportunity to testify live, and we'll just put her card in.

The next witness -- Members, we have three more, I think, that would love to -- that are here to testify before us.

TESTIMONY BY JONI ASHBROOK

SEN. DUNCAN: Joni Ashbrook?

Ms. Ashbrook, would you please state your name and who you represent? And please observe the three-minute time limit.

MS. ASHBROOK: Yes, sir. My name is Joni Ashbrook. I represent myself. I'm a precinct chair, and I have been an election judge in Bastrop
I appreciate Sen. Fraser's comments that the intent of this bill is to help people vote. However, I'm having an incredibly hard time understanding how this bill will actually do that. I often walk. I don't understand how it will help the very poor, elderly and disabled people in my precinct that I often walk and see. I see how incredibly difficult their circumstances are. And when they're trying to just keep a crumbling roof over their heads, how is keeping -- or how is asking them or requiring them to have more paperwork and possibly more cost help them with their sacred right to vote?

Sen. Fraser also said that voter fraud, no matter how small, should be addressed. I totally agree, but since there's no real threat -- or excuse me -- no real evidence of voter fraud in Texas that this bill would address, why isn't this body looking for the real threats to the integrity of our elections?

The first and foremost threat to the -- to our elections is the use of electronic voting machines that count our votes in secret and run software that we, the people, are not allowed to see. There have been studies done by the GAO, the Brennan
Center for Justice, Princeton, Carter-Baker Commission, just to name a few that have concluded that these machines are not secure and can be manipulated.

This is not a trumped-up charge about one person risking deportation or prosecution to cast a single vote. This is the ability for one person to manipulate millions of votes in secret. When Senator Fraser spoke of loss of voter confidence in our electoral system, this is enemy number one.

There's another real problem that I would like to see this body address, and that -- and the Secretary of State even admits can cause multiple votes. It happened -- an incident happened in my precinct in 2008, the General Election. My polling place had two computers. That was the database where people would come to check in. A man came through early in the morning, he voted. He came back through, he happened to be a friend of the election judge, the Republican. And he said "I want to test the system." So he went through again at the same computer that he went to. He was not allowed to vote. He went to the next computer. He was allowed to vote. We stopped it when it came to the ticket that was coming out, the sticker, but he was allowed -- he would have been
allowed to vote.

I called the Secretary of State's Office. They agreed with me that this is possible. The machines do not talk to one another. So I think that's probably what those other two people were talking about. Is that my time?

SEN. DUNCAN: Ms. Ashbrook, I'm sorry, your time is up. Let me ask if there are any members who would like to ask a question.

(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair hears none. We appreciate your appearance in the Texas Senate today.

MS. ASHBROOK: Thank you.

TESTIMONY BY DUANE RAWSON

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair calls Duane Ronson -- Rawson. Mr. Rawson, please state your name and who you represent, and please observe the three-minute time limit.

MR. RAWSON: My name is Duane Rawson from Goldthwaite, Texas, Mills County, and I'm Mills County Republican Chairman there, and I've been here since yesterday. Oh, I'm sorry. I've been here since yesterday about between 9:30 and ten o'clock. I have sat -- I've listened to all reasoning why this should be approved, why it shouldn't be approved.
But the main thing that they were saying as far as for voter fraud, you have people that say it doesn't exist, but yet we've had the Secretary of State that showed examples why it did -- why we did need something like this.

The voters registration is -- it's an easy thing to copy. Voters ID there's -- it's a law, first of all, that you're supposed to have some type of ID with you when the authorities pull you over. And if you don't, by rights they have to take you to jail because you don't have the proper means of ID, which causes the state money having to do that.

If you look at it, if you have -- if the people -- as people are saying, $35,000 or less can't afford this, which I don't see what there is to afford because it's free. If they have the opportunity to have the proper ID, it may help them to want to keep their ID card with them and help taxpayers as far as not having to pay the law enforcement, the extra money of having to arrest that individual, taking them to jail, booking them, returning them after the court trial.

There's a lot of reasons why I feel that we do need it. I am a disabled vet. I've been in the military for 16-1/2 years. I continue to support my
country. And if this is what I need to do to be able
to have my constitutional right to vote, by God I'll
be -- I'll do it with pride. I keep two forms of ID
with me anyway. So having to carry ID with me to vote
it's not -- it shouldn't be a problem.

We can always find a reason to fight
against something. What about trying to find a reason
to work together to try to make something work that's
going to better us?

I spoke to veterans and law enforcement
from my county, Mills County, and they state the same
thing. They feel that this bill should be approved.
That's all I have.

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr. Rawson.

Members, do you have any questions for Mr. Rawson?

(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair hears none.

Thank you for your appearance today, and I think you
go out to the -- to the right.

TESTIMONY BY ROD FLUKER

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair recognizes
Dr. Rod Fluker. Mr. Fluker, state your name, who you
represent, and please observe the three-minute time
limit.

MR. FLUKER: To the distinguished and
shall I say sleep-deprived Members of the Texas Senate, my name is Dr. Rod Fluker, and I am a Past President of the organization and now Executive Director of the Texas Association of Black Personnel in Higher Education.

Today I bring you greetings from our State Board of Directors and from Dr. Felicia Scott, our State President. The Texas Association of Black Personnel in Higher Education, or TABPHE as we call it, is an educational organization of faculty, staff and administrators that numbers hundreds statewide.

TABPHE was founded 36 years ago to address pertinent issues that impact African-Americans in particular and people of color in general.

Senate Bill 362 or the voter ID bill causes our members and many others grave concerns about the negative impact of passing such useless and harmless legislation will have on the voting rights of millions of already disenfranchised Texans.

We believe that laws should be created to promote civil living and/or right a wrong. The voter ID bill does neither. Promoting civil living would mean to make it easier for Texans to vote, not make it more difficulty. Adding new barriers such as additional ID requirements is likened to the Negro
poll taxes and voting competency tests used during the
days of the Jim Crow Laws and as recently as the
1960s. So this legislation works against promoting
civil living.

This useless and harmless legislation
also fails to right any wrong. The fact is that there
is no evidence of significant voter fraud, period. Of
millions of votes cast in Texas during the last six
years, voter impersonation is practically nonexistent,
both in Texas and across our nation.

Therefore, the Texas Association of
Black Personnel in Higher Education ask that all state
Senators, both Republican and Democrat, as good
ambassadors of the people of Texas to vote against
Senate Bill 362. Thank you.

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Dr. Fluker.

Are there any questions for Dr. Fluker?

(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: All right. The Chair
hears none. Thank you for your appearance today in
the Texas Senate.

Members, we had a number of people
testify or signed up to testify -- oh, excuse me.
Dr. Fluker wants to submit Exhibit 64 as his
testimony. Thank you, Dr. Fluker. Exhibit 54,
5-4 (sic). Okay.

(Exhibit No. 55 marked and admitted)

SEN. DUNCAN: Members, there were a number of people that signed up to testify but who did not come when called to do so, either because they left or couldn't be here. We will enter their names in the record and record the position as indicated on their card.

We also have a number of cards that -- quite a number of cards of people who have registered a position on the bill but do not wish to testify, and those will be made a part of the record as well.

Members, I think one thing I want to maybe -- it might be a good idea for us to set aside the decorum rule a little bit and clap for those witnesses who stayed here and listened to our testimony. I think that was --

(Applause)

SEN. DUNCAN: Members, the Chair will -- there being no other witnesses to come before the Committee, the Chair will close public testimony.

Members, we'll stand at ease for a few minutes. The court reporter has been going for a couple of hours, and I would -- we'll be back in -- we'll go back in session at 9:15 -- or I'm sorry.
Excuse me. It's been a long day. The Senate will stand at ease until 9:15.

Sen. Deuell, for what purpose?

SEN. DEUELL: Mr. President, before we come back and we address the vote, I just wanted to say how proud I am of the Members of the Texas Senate. We have debated a very, very sensitive issue that has votes strong sides -- strong feelings on both sides, and I just wanted to express my appreciation to the Members and to the public that was here. I think that this was an example of how democracy in this country is supposed to work.

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you, Senator. I agree.

Members, we'll stand at ease. Let's make it -- let's make it -- hang on a minute. I'm sorry.

Sen. Zaffirini?

SEN. ZAFFIRINI: I'm glad that Sen. Deuell is happy because today is his birthday. We should all join in wishing him a very happy birthday.

(Applause)

SEN. DUNCAN: Members, we've been taking a ten-minute break. Instead of 15, let's just go and
stand at ease until 9:10.

SEN. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman?

SEN. DUNCAN: Sen. Patrick?

SEN. PATRICK: I just wanted to thank the staff from our Sergeant-at-Arms to our messenger. I know -- I think Courtney just left. She was here from six o'clock last night as our messenger until seven this morning, and all the staff members. I know we're still continuing, but I want to thank everyone who stayed here throughout the night.

SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you. Stand at ease until 9:10 a.m.

(Recess: 9:00 a.m. to 9:12 a.m.)

SEN. DUNCAN: The Committee of the Whole will come back to order. Members, if you could take your seats?

Sen. Fraser, you're recognized for a motion. He isn't here. Sen. Fraser, you're recognized for a motion.

SEN. FRASER: And if you don't mind, I'm waiting for all the Senators that came in, that stayed here all night.

Members, I -- it was a pretty amazing night, and it makes me remember why I'm so proud to be
a member of this body. I appreciate so much the -- I
appreciate so much everyone, the way they conducted
themselves. Thank you. Thank you to the staff.
Thank you for the witnesses. We appreciate it.

I would now move to report Senate
Bill 362 to the full Senate with the recommendation
that it do pass and be printed.

SEN. DUNCAN: Sen. Fraser moves that
Senate Bill 362 be reported to the full Senate with
the recommendation that it do pass and be printed.
The clerk -- the secretary will call the roll.

ROLL CALL NO. 3

SECRETARY SPAW: Averitt?
SEN. AVERITT: (Indicated "aye" vote)
SECRETARY SPAW: Carona?
SEN. CARONA: (Indicated "aye" vote)
SECRETARY SPAW: Davis?
SEN. DAVIS: (Indicated "nay" vote)
SECRETARY SPAW: Deuell?
SEN. DEUELL: (Indicated "aye" vote)
SECRETARY SPAW: Duncan?
SEN. DUNCAN: (Indicated "aye" vote)
SECRETARY SPAW: Ellis?
SEN. ELLIS: (Indicated "nay" vote)
SECRETARY SPAW: Eltife?
SEN. ELTIFE: (Indicated "aye" vote)
SECRETARY SPAW: Estes?
SEN. ESTES: (Indicated "aye" vote)
SECRETARY SPAW: Fraser?
SEN. FRASER: (Indicated "aye" vote)
SECRETARY SPAW: Gallegos?
SEN. GALLEGOS: (Indicated "nay" vote)
SECRETARY SPAW: Harris?
SEN. HARRIS: (Indicated "aye" vote)
SECRETARY SPAW: Hegar?
SEN. HEGAR: (Indicated "aye" vote)
SECRETARY SPAW: Hinojosa?
SEN. HINOJOSA: (Indicated "nay" vote)
SECRETARY SPAW: Huffman?
SEN. HUFFMAN: (Indicated "aye" vote)
SECRETARY SPAW: Jackson?
SEN. JACKSON: (Indicated "aye" vote)
SECRETARY SPAW: Lucio?
SEN. LUCIO: (Indicated "nay" vote)
SECRETARY SPAW: Nelson?
SEN. NELSON: (Indicated "aye" vote)
SECRETARY SPAW: Nichols?
SEN. NICHOLS: (Indicated "aye" vote)
SECRETARY SPAW: Ogden?
SEN. OGDEN: (Indicated "aye" vote)
SECRETARY SPAW: Patrick?

SEN. PATRICK: (Indicated "aye" vote)

SECRETARY SPAW: Seliger?

SEN. SELIGER: (Indicated "aye" vote)

SECRETARY SPAW: Shapiro?

SEN. SHAPIRO: (Indicated "aye" vote)

SECRETARY SPAW: Shapleigh?

SEN. SHAPLEIGH: (Indicated "nay" vote)

SECRETARY SPAW: Uresti?

SEN. URESTI: (Indicated "nay" vote)

SECRETARY SPAW: Van de Putte?

SEN. VAN de PUTTE: (Indicated "nay" vote)

SECRETARY SPAW: Watson?

SEN. WATSON: (Indicated "nay" vote)

SECRETARY SPAW: Wentworth?

SEN. WENTWORTH: (Indicated "aye" vote)

SECRETARY SPAW: West?

SEN. WEST: (Indicated "nay" vote)

SECRETARY SPAW: Whitmire?

SEN. WHITMIRE: No.

SECRETARY SPAW: Williams?

SEN. WILLIAMS: (Indicated "aye" vote)

SECRETARY SPAW: Zaffirini?

SEN. ZAFFIRINI: (Indicated "nay" vote)
SECRETARY SPAW: Mr. President?

SEN. DUNCAN: (Indicated "aye" vote)

SECRETARY SPAW: That was the vote, 20 to 12; 20 "ayes" and 12 "nays".

SEN. DUNCAN: There being 20 "ayes" and 12 "nos", Senate Bill 362 will be reported to the full Senate with the recommendation it do pass and be printed.

Sen. Whitmire, for what purpose?

SEN. WHITMIRE: I was going to recognize this body for its outstanding work. I've been here 36 years, 26 in the Senate. I've seen filibusters go all night long and Members just kind of scatter and are on call, but I have never -- and would be surprised if anyone, Patsy, can recall the body starting one day, going all night, all Members present, conducting themselves like ladies and gentlemen. So I'm just real proud, Troy and Lieutenant Governor, each and every one of you. Our two freshmen made outstanding contributions.

And I just really stood up -- really stood up to recognize Sen. Duncan, a very tough job, it was very fair, and we're really proud of you as a Member of the Senate.

(Applause)
SEN. DUNCAN: Thank you.

SEN. DEUELL: Mr. President?

SEN. DUNCAN: Sen. Deuell?

SEN. DEUELL: A parliamentary inquiry. The vote was 20 to 12. I understand that the Lieutenant Governor takes your seat. Does that exclude you from voting? Have we acted properly in that regard?

SEN. DUNCAN: Yes, Senator.

SEN. DEUELL: I understand there's 31 with that vote, but --

SEN. DUNCAN: The Chair and the President are entitled to vote --

SEN. DEUELL: Okay.

SEN. DUNCAN: -- in the Committee of the Whole.

SEN. DEUELL: I just wanted to clarify that.

SEN. DUNCAN: Yes, sir. Thank you. All right, Members, the Chair happily recognizes Sen. Wentworth for a motion.

SEN. WHITMIRE: Mr. President, I move the Committee of the Whole Senate rise and report.

SEN. DUNCAN: Members, you've heard the motion. Is there any objection?
(No response)

SEN. DUNCAN: There is no objection.

The Senate will rise and report.

(Proceedings concluded for purposes of this record at 9:18 a.m.)
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The Senate met at 10:21 a.m. pursuant to adjournment and was called to order by the President.

The roll was called and the following Senators were present: Averitt, Carona, Davis, Deuell, Duncan, Ellis, Eltife, Estes, Fraser, Gallegos, Harris, Hegar, Hinojosa, Huffman, Jackson, Lucio, Nelson, Nichols, Ogden, Patrick, Seliger, Shapiro, Shapleigh, Uresti, Van de Putte, Watson, Wentworth, West, Whitmire, Williams, Zaffirini.

The President announced that a quorum of the Senate was present.

The Reverend Jacqueline Baker, Hyde Park Christian Church, Austin, offered the invocation as follows:

Gracious and loving God, for this time and place, we give thanks. For this day and this opportunity to work together in harmony and with hope for the future, we are grateful. For the privilege of being called to serve the public, we are ever mindful. May we ever realize the worth and place and value and purpose of each and every person. May we ever understand that the work we do also has worth and value and purpose, and with this in mind, let us join together to work side by side and shoulder to shoulder to meet the needs of those we are called to represent. Heart to heart and hand in hand let us respond to the challenges we face with innovative, creative solutions. Let us be determined not to become locked in negative or destructive patterns but instead finding new and courageous ways of working together and touching the future. With this in mind, help us to find common ground. Help us to seek a common goal and identify a common good. Help us to see all faces and hear all voices. Help us to work together, always mindful of the future and of the fact that our words and actions today make a real difference and that we are charged with the responsibility of planting seeds which will bear good fruit. May we ever realize that our presence here truly matters. May future generations look to us as an example of unity and constructive cooperation. May our children look to us as examples of peace and reconciliation. With humble hearts then, let us serve. With gracious and gentle spirits, let us work together. With mindful
and caring intent, let us seek the well-being of all those people, Your people, our people, all people that we are called to tend. We pray all these things in a spirit of love and service. Amen.

Senator Whitmire moved that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday be dispensed with and the Journal be approved as printed.

The motion prevailed without objection.

**CO-AUTHOR OF SENATE BILL 362**

On motion of Senator Fraser, Senator Nelson will be shown as Co-author of SB 362.

**PHYSICIAN OF THE DAY**

Senator Huffman was recognized and presented Dr. Jimmy Clay Burns of West Columbia as the Physician of the Day.

The Senate welcomed Dr. Burns and thanked him for his participation in the Physician of the Day program sponsored by the Texas Academy of Family Physicians.

**RESOLUTIONS SIGNED**

The President announced the signing of the following enrolled resolutions in the presence of the Senate: SCR 18, SCR 29, SCR 31, SCR 36, HCR 46.

**GUESTS PRESENTED**

Senator Shapiro was recognized and introduced to the Senate a delegation of students from Hillcrest High School in Dallas.

The Senate welcomed its guests.

**GUESTS PRESENTED**

Senator Carona was recognized and introduced to the Senate a delegation representing Young Professionals of Greater Dallas.

The Senate welcomed its guests.

**SENATE RESOLUTION 408**

Senator Duncan offered the following resolution:

WHEREAS, Article III, Section 9, and Article IV, Section 16 of the Texas Constitution, and Article XIII of the Senate Rules recognize the existence of the Committee of the Whole Senate; and

WHEREAS, Pursuant to Senate Rule 7.06, the President referred Senate Bill 362, relating to voter identification requirements, directly to the Committee of the Whole Senate; and

WHEREAS, Senate Rule 13.01 provides that it is in order for the Senate at any time after bills and resolutions have been called to resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole Senate; and

WHEREAS, The Senate may adopt by resolution specific procedures to govern the operation of the Committee of the Whole Senate during its consideration of Senate Bill 362; now, therefore, be it...
RESOLVED, That the Senate resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole Senate on Tuesday, March 10, 2009, at the conclusion of the morning call, for the consideration of Senate Bill 362; and, be it further
RESOLVED, That the Senate may meet as in Committee of the Whole Senate from day to day as necessary; and, be it further
RESOLVED, That the following procedures shall apply when in Committee of the Whole Senate for the duration of its consideration of Senate Bill 362:
1. The Committee shall afford reasonable opportunity to interested parties to appear and testify before the Committee.
2. The Chair shall require all parties appearing at the meeting to swear or affirm that the testimony they give to the Committee is true and correct.
3. The Chair may fix the order of appearance and time allotted for each witness unless a majority of the members present directs otherwise.
4. Senate Rules addressing access to the Senate Floor shall be enforced by the Chair while the Committee is meeting, except as follows:
   (a) Witnesses appearing before the committee may be admitted to the floor of the Senate as their names are called by the Chair, and may remain only until their testimony is completed.
   (b) Each Senator may be assisted by one employee of the Senate within the brass rail at any given time. The Sergeant-at-Arms shall provide seating next to a requesting senator for such authorized employees.
5. Senate Rule 3.04, relating to posters, placards, banners and signs, and Senate Rule 3.05 relating to applause, outbursts, and demonstrations shall be strictly enforced by the Chair. Subject to approval by the Chair, witnesses may use visual aids as necessary in the presentation of their testimony.
6. Senate Rule 3.01, relating to attire, shall not apply to witnesses.

SR 408 was read and was adopted by the following vote: Yeas 19, Nays 12.

Yeas: Averitt, Carona, Duncan, Eltife, Estes, Fraser, Harris, Hegar, Huffman, Jackson, Nelson, Nichols, Ogden, Patrick, Seliger, Shapiro, Wentworth, Williams.


REMARKS ORDERED PRINTED

On motion of Senator Van de Putte and by unanimous consent, all remarks regarding SR 408 were ordered reduced to writing and printed in the Senate Journal as follows:

President: Senator Van de Putte, did you wish to, to rise on this?

Senator Van de Putte: Thank you Mr. President. I’d like to ask the author of the resolution a few questions.

President: Will Senator Duncan yield to Senator Van de Putte?

Senator Duncan: I yield.
Senator Van de Putte: Thank you, Senator Duncan, and thank you, Mr. President. Senator Duncan, your resolution is a culmination of a lot of discussions between our colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, is it not?

Senator Duncan: Yes, Senator. I tried to collect ideas from everybody, about the, at least what should be in the resolution.

Senator Van de Putte: And, Senator, there came a point in the deliberations and the discussions, after which, consulting with my Democratic colleagues, I delivered a memo dated March the 3rd to you with respect to our specific requests. Is that not correct?

Senator Duncan: That’s correct.

Senator Van de Putte: And, Senator Duncan, among those, we requested more time to prepare for this Committee of the Whole hearing on, at that time, in that memo we renewed our protests that the Texas Senate has no business taking up and considering voter identification legislation before addressing other issues of broad importance to Texans. Was that in the memo? Do you remember that?

Senator Duncan: I believe you mentioned something like that in your memo to me and others.

Senator Van de Putte: And, Senator Duncan, if, do you remember that back in the very first week of the session as the, my Republican colleagues in this Senate were changing the rules to make sure that voter ID would pass the Senate, that the Democratic colleagues voted unanimously to also take up as a special order, so that it would be easier to pass other pieces of legislation addressing the issues important to Texans?

Senator Duncan: I remember there was some discussion about that in the debate on January the 14th.

Senator Van de Putte: Do you remember, Senator Duncan, what those issues which we proposed were?

Senator Duncan: No, that was a long day, and I don’t, I couldn’t be specific to recite those to you.

Senator Van de Putte: Well, Senator Duncan, let me briefly state, they, Democrats unanimously supported and were unanimously voted down by the Republicans to make it easier for the Senate to pass legislation on the following issues: full restoration of the Children's Health Insurance Program funding, lowering tuition costs, lowering homeowners' insurance rates, preventing foreclosures, economic development and job creation, funding our neighborhood public schools, and enhancing benefits for veterans. Does that refresh your memory a little bit? Do you remember what those issues were?

(Applause)

Senator Duncan: I remember discussions concerning that. And, Members, could I, and I think for the day, while we’re talking about this–

President: (Gavel) It's probably going to be a long day, and the Chair is going to enforce respect for, so if, if we could not have reactions from the gallery, I'd appreciate it.
Senator Duncan: Senator, I believe those issues were raised and those votes, whatever, if there were amendments that were added, I think they were not adopted by the body. I do know that the committees have been meeting and deliberating on those very issues all session long, and, typically, those kinds of bills take a while and they get to the floor in due course of time.

Senator Van de Putte: Thank you, Senator Duncan, and out of the issues that we, as Democrats and Republicans, brought forward as issues that were, seemed so important that it needed to be considered via a special order and considered by the full Senate Committee of the Whole, there was only one surviving issue from that discussion, was it not?

Senator Duncan: Well, I think so. This issue was the one that survived the debate.

Senator Van de Putte: So, the only issue that survived all of the special orders was the issue of voter identification. Is that not true?

Senator Duncan: I think that the bill, that the resolution, or at least the rule that was adopted, dealt with this this particular issue on special order, yes.

Senator Van de Putte: Senator Duncan, back to the memorandum and our requests that I delivered to you last week, I wanted to remind you that the first week to explain why that protest was made in the memo and why we were protesting the artificial elevation of this issue above all orders and, as all others, as something that somehow deserves all this attention. And that request, the one to give us more time to prepare for this hearing and, frankly, to give the Texas Senate more time to make progress on the other issues that today are in the back seat, in favor of this issue. What was the response to our request to give us more time and to put off the voter ID hearing today so that we could take up more important issues?

Senator Duncan: Well, I think that there was not a consensus to extend the time for hearing it. And I think I responded to you that Senator Fraser, I think, had visited with each Member of the Senate, or at least provided a letter on February 26th, providing notice that he intended to take, request that this bill be taken up on this date. And then, also, a public notice was posted on March the 4th of the hearing. So, that's normally more, lot more time than we usually have for any sort of legislation that is going to be heard in public hearing during a legislative session and much more than is required by the rules.

Senator Van de Putte: And thank you, Senator Duncan, but, basically, our request was denied that we put other issues that are very important to the citizens of this state. The second request–

Senator Duncan: There wasn't a consensus to do that. I would agree with that.

Senator Van de Putte: Thank you. The second request in my memo was that in response to your original offer that each side be given three or four slots for expert witnesses, I had requested eight slots per side. Is that correct?

Senator Duncan: I think you, I think that's what is, I think your letter requested as many as eight, if I recall correctly. Let me get my glasses on, but I'll take your word for it.
Senator Van de Putte: And those eight people that I asked for are in the building today, some of whom have flown in from across the country, and they're still waiting to see if they'll be afforded the respect of their national stature on the associated issues that are demanding. They still don't know if they'll be able to, allowed to testify as an invited expert witness.

Senator Duncan: Well, Senator, I think I had asked you last night, and I think both the proponents of this issue and the opponents of the issue have, or the opposition, have submitted a list of witnesses to the Secretary of the Senate, and I think I have a list of that for everyone, and I think each one of your witnesses is listed on that. And, certainly, they will be considered invited testimony and will appear. It would be my plan, if this resolution is adopted, that those witnesses be allowed to testify at the front, and I would propose that we would allow alternating witnesses. In other words those, one in favor of the bill and one opposed to the bill, so that we get a good feel for this as we go through. So, yes, they will be allowed to testify.

Senator Van de Putte: Well, thank you for clarifying that, because as we stand here this morning, I wasn't sure how many expert witnesses that were going to be allowed--

Senator Duncan: Well, I apologize--

Senator Van de Putte: For us.

Senator Duncan: I thought I made clear that we really weren't going to limit--

Senator Van de Putte: Okay.

Senator Duncan: Try to limit that part of your testimony. But I think if you've got these eight, well, then that would be appropriate for us to move forward with those eight. I think the proponents of the legislation have less than that, but then after that, and what we want to know here, we have a lot of people that want to testify as well--

(Applause)

Senator Duncan: And so, we want to make sure and, and as you know, too, there's, and I want to talk a little bit about this, to make sure there's some understanding. We want those witnesses to testify, we want to have a good, high quality debate here with regard to this bill, yet, we really, one of the things that I am going to ask the Senate to, and the Sergeant to enforce as we go through, is that we not have applause or demonstrations in the gallery and that we strictly enforce that, so that out of respect for the witnesses who'll be testifying and out of respect for the time that we need to be able to deliberate this, this bill--

Senator Van de Putte: Thank you--

Senator Duncan: And the decorum of this, this beautiful Chamber.

Senator Van de Putte: Thank you, Senator Duncan. I'm glad to have an answer on that, and we certainly believe that the decorum of the Senate, and that our guests will be invited to give that testimony, and we are in accordance with your wishes that we adhere to the decorum of the Senate. Senator, the next request on my memo to you was that the Senate provide qualified legal representation to each side on this debate. There are many constitutional issues at stake. We already know from experience in Indiana and Georgia that the results of what this legislation might pass will go straight
to the U.S. Department of Justice and into the federal courts. We know that for a fact. And yet, we will not have, on both sides, any of this fight, a qualified legal representation. Is that true?

Senator Duncan: The party caucuses will not be provided qualified legal representation. That's correct. Or any legal, I mean, the Senate will not provide independent counsel for the party caucuses. That's correct.

Senator Van de Putte: Thank you, Senator. Next, we requested that a stenographer be provided to record all the proceedings of the Committee of the Whole testimony and deliberations, and the subsequent deliberations of the Texas Senate on this legislation. Because of the certainty of the Department of Justice and federal litigation on this, you indicated in your response that the prospects, that it looked good at the time. Are we now prepared with a stenographer to record these proceedings and include them in the committee report and in the Senate Journal in full?

Senator Duncan: Senator, that, we have worked and Secretary of the Senate's office and my staff have worked together to arrange for a stenographic, or stenographer to be present to record the official record of the hearing.

Senator Van de Putte: Thank you, at least that's one thing we got in our requests. Senator, I also wanted to, for the record, state that since we are in the Senate Chamber, that all the proceedings can be viewed currently on the Internet, as we normally do with video streaming. Since the Committee of the Whole will resolve, but will be so in this Chamber, will that free access to the public be accorded when we resolve into the Committee of the Whole?

Senator Duncan: Free access to the Chamber will be afforded, or to the gallery, as normal, with normal security procedures. There will also be an overflow room that will accommodate, if there is a need for that, will accommodate our guests here, too, and our constituents, and they can be watching this on TV at the same time. The process will also provide that when we call names for witnesses, we will try to make sure that each of the witnesses have an opportunity to arrive at the Chamber and be admitted. But as far as the floor, the Senate floor will remain under strict, you know, under our decorum rules that we normally abide by during a session of the Senate.

Senator Van de Putte: And, Senator Duncan, for the record, all of the proceedings now and the Committee of the Whole will be able to have that transparency of Texas public government, as it will be available live video streamed on the Internet?

Senator Duncan: I am not, I would assume that that's the case, and I understand that this will be done as our normal sessions are, under a live video stream, is what I'm advised.

Senator Van de Putte: So, Senator Duncan, that is an affirmative?

Senator Duncan: That's the nod I got (laughter), and I think you did, too.

Senator Van de Putte: Thank you, Senator Duncan. Senator, we requested in that memo that the Attorney General make himself available as a resource witness in the Committee of the Whole, and you responded at the time that you were doubtful. You said, given the fact that the Office of the Attorney General will represent the State of Texas in litigation, if any, arising out of this legislation, it would be inappropriate to
present the Attorney General at this time. Senator Duncan, is it true that the Attorney General or his designee testified at several points in the process during the 2001 redistricting hearings, which were sure to go to court?

Senator Duncan: Senator, I’m not sure. I don’t recall and I wouldn’t want to answer that without going back and looking at the record. I don’t recall, but again, I haven’t looked at the record to determine that.

Senator Van de Putte: And, Senator, isn’t it also true that the Attorney General or his designee testified during the 2003 redistricting hearings, that were sure to go to court, and it was true that the Attorney General or his designee testified on this very same voter ID legislation in the last session of the Legislature?

Senator Duncan: Senator, I would have to go back and look at the records. I haven’t done that. I understand it’s generally a policy that they, if litigation is imminent on a piece of legislation, that they typically don’t testify.

Senator Van de Putte: Well, Senator Duncan, I’m surprised, because suddenly we don’t want our Attorney General to comment on anything that would go to court. And, Senator, with all due respect, the Attorney General is the state’s lawyer. Don’t you think it would be helpful for the state’s lawyer, in the State Senate, to hear his views on the laws that we’re about to change, so that, that he will have to defend?

Senator Duncan: Well, Senator, I think there’s a process that normally and, I think, should always be involved, is that opinions of the attorney, the Attorney General has an opinion process for advising on issues that are before the, the body. I’ve always had a concern as the attorney, with the Attorney General appearing as a witness in a legislative deliberation or debate, if he is going to be the actual attorney who will representing the people of the State of Texas in litigation arising out of that. So, you know, typically just, I’m not going to speak for the Attorney General here, but I’ll speak for myself, I think that the Attorney General is not a proper witness in a case where we know that the, and I think everyone has made it clear that whatever we do in resolution of this issue, if it is passed, that there will be a review by the court system and certainly with D.O.J., or through the preclearance process. So, I think that certainly litigation of some type is imminent. In my view, it would be inappropriate for the Attorney General to be a witness in that legislative debate.

Senator Van de Putte: Well, Senator Duncan, I know that for a fact the Attorney General did participate in this very same piece of legislation last year in the House and had his designee in the House hearings. I thought, now, I’m not an attorney, but I thought when something goes to litigation that that’s why we have the solicitor general argue those cases, that it is standard practice. But, Senator Duncan, I believe you, but you may or may not know that the Senate Democrats faxed a letter to General Abbott late yesterday evening extending the request directly to him. And I guess you’re not prepared to produce the Attorney General so that we can get the benefits of his experience after his office and he spent over 1.4 million tax dollars looking for the sort of voter fraud that this legislation would address and not getting a single conviction for that sort of fraud for his efforts. I just thought his experience in that would be relevant to what we’re about to discuss. And so, you’re not going to produce him, and he is ignoring our request.
Senator Duncan: Well, Senator, I'm not the author of the bill, nor, and, do I have the power to compel the Attorney General to appear. So, you know, I guess that would have to be my response to your question. I think that was a question. (Laughter)

Senator Van de Putte: Well, Senator Duncan, I really believe you when you say that you want to proceed in a constructive way, and I think all of our colleagues believe in your abilities. But to tell you the truth, out of all of the important requests regarding the ground rules, which we believe as important components toward representing our constituents, we've gotten our, a little more, I mean, we've got our extra expert witnesses and a court reporter, and that, I just wanted to note that might help explain why I think the Democrats will respectfully vote "No" on the resolution. But beyond the specifics of our request regarding the process for considering this bill, let me respectfully offer maybe an insight as to one of the reasons that, respectfully, we will vote "No" on this resolution. It's because, Senator Duncan, it's not about voter ID. I've always looked forward to the day when discrimination and voter suppression are things of the past. But the fact that we have to debate voter ID tells me that we aren't there yet. This voter ID bill echoes a history of voter suppression in our great state, but, unfortunately, it's not just minority voting rights that are threatened by the voter ID bill. The laws threaten seniors and lower income Texans who don't drive and don't have a photo ID and have no easy or free way to get one. Your proposals for debate are taken into consideration, but, Senator, the proposed voter ID law would force thousands of poll workers to enforce the new ID requirements, and this is just a recipe for catastrophe, for confusion that could deny a ballot to women and to students whose names or address and ID doesn't match on the name and address the voter rolls. Senator Duncan, are you aware that it's more likely for a person to be struck by lightning than to impersonate a voter?

Senator Duncan: I have--

Senator Van de Putte: And by--

Senator Duncan: I have no data to support that.

President: (Gavel)

Senator Williams: Mr. President.

Senator Van de Putte: By contrast, Senator Duncan, over a million Texans registered to vote who had no driver's license last year.

Senator Williams: Mr. President.

Senator Van de Putte: I will continue on my questions of Senator Duncan.

President: Senator Williams, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?

Senator Williams: Mr. President, I rise to request that you instruct the Sergeant-at-Arms to strictly enforce Rule 3.05, no applause, outburst, or other demonstration by any spectator shall be permitted during the Senate, session of the Senate, and that this rule shall be strictly enforced.

President: So ordered.
Senator Van de Putte: Thank you Mr. President. Senator Duncan, I, most of us take a photo ID for granted. There's no public policy reason for this, and I understand the difficulty that you've been placed with in offering this resolution. Because that partisanship alone is the reason voter ID was singled out to be considered outside the traditional Senate Two-thirds Rule. Senator Duncan, I know that you've put a lot of time into this resolution and into the requests and deliberate, but I hope you will understand why we will vote "No" on the resolution, not to disrespect you, but of our real need to unite to solve Texas' real problems. It's the special treatment of this voter ID bill that proves some politicians still don't get the message that the voters sent to us in this last election cycle. With all due respect, Senator Duncan, that's why we cannot support your resolution. That's why we cannot support this resulting process and ultimately why we cannot support the resulting legislation.

Senator Duncan: Thank you, Senator, and I appreciate your position, and I also, but I will say this, too, I also appreciate the fact that you have allowed me to sit down with you and members of your caucus, so that at least I can understand your concerns and, hopefully, we can have a very orderly hearing and treat our guests and each other with appropriate decorum. And I appreciate your approach here. Thank you very much.

Senator Van de Putte: Senator Duncan, following our conversations on this Senate floor today, and particularly our conversations about the court reporter, I'd like to move that the entirety of our dialogue this morning and the testimony that we will be hearing be reduced to writing and placed into the committee report for this legislation.

President: Would Senator Van de Putte approach the podium for a moment?

(Pause)

President: (Gavel) Senator Van de Putte, if I understand, you're going to withdraw your motion, and you're going to make a new motion.

Senator Van de Putte: Yes, Mr. President, if I could be allowed to--

President: You're recognized.

Senator Van de Putte: Ask questions of the Chairman? Senator Duncan, I know that it has been affirmed that all of this is proceedings today, and when we resolve into the Committee of the Whole, that this will be available for video streaming and accessibility and transparency to our Texans. And following our conversation earlier about a court reporter, I would like to move that the entirety of the dialogue and the questions that we have had here this morning be reduced to writing and placed into the journal. And at, then at the appropriate time when we resolve into the Committee of the Whole, that the discussion about the court reporter and what will be the record of the Committee of the Whole will be discussed at that time. Is that correct?

Senator Duncan: That's my understanding.

Senator Van de Putte: Thank you, Senator Duncan. I appreciate and I deeply respect you. I know that this is a difficult task, and I do not look forward to the day's proceedings.
Senator Duncan: Well, thank you, Senator, and I look forward, though, to working with each and every one of you to try to resolve this through the committee in an orderly fashion. And I appreciate your help.

President: Senator Ellis, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?

Senator Ellis: Ask a couple of questions of Senator Duncan.

President: Will Senator Duncan yield to Senator Ellis?

Senator Ellis: Senator Van de Putte made reference to a request that the Attorney General come over. Now, if my memory serves me correctly, the last time we met in Committee of the Whole was on the issue of redistricting. And I'm relatively sure that the Attorney General or a representative did participate in those proceedings. So, I want to hone in on this a little bit more so I get a sense of if there's a precedent being established that if it's a matter that will possibly go to litigation, the Attorney General will not come. I saw in one of the press accounts that the Attorney General was asked not to come. Now, from you all's discussion, I got the impression that you couldn't speak for the Attorney General, and maybe the Attorney General was declining to come. So, my question is, did you ask that the Attorney General not come or not?

Senator Duncan: No, no. I, that's not my decision about whether or not the Attorney General comes or not. That's his.

Senator Ellis: Okay. So, as the–

Senator Duncan: His–

Senator Ellis: Presiding Officer–

Senator Duncan: His office is an independent office, and if he desires to be here, he can. If he desires not to be here, I would assume that he would not, not be compelled to come, as I understand the rules in a Committee of the Whole.

Senator Ellis: Okay.

Senator Duncan: My, what I have laid out would be my, my personal position would be is that if the Attorney General does have, if litigation is imminent with regard to legislation that we may be considering, that it would be inappropriate for the Attorney General to appear as a witness in the deliberations over that bill. And that's where my objections (inaudible, overlapping conversation)–

Senator Ellis: Well, if the Attorney General were not appearing as a witness, would you have any personal objection to the Attorney General appearing as a resource? You know, I'm thinking, Jessica's Law, last session, which was already the subject of a case pending before the United States Supreme Court. You know, whether Attorney General is there as a witness or not, I mean, I just think both sides ought to have some sense–

Senator Duncan: Senator, I think–

Senator Ellis: Of the law from our state's chief–

Senator Duncan: Either side is–
Senator Ellis: Law enforcement officer.

Senator Duncan: I think, to answer your question, I think either side is entitled to extend an invitation to the Attorney General, and I think that being an independent elected official and the Attorney General, which is in the executive branch of the government, that he could respond accordingly, but–

Senator Ellis: Because I would hope–

Senator Duncan: That's as far as I'd go with it.

Senator Ellis: When we do start our proceedings that the Attorney General's office is listening, because I think that is important, whether it is the actual Attorney General or a representative. And I'm sure whether someone agrees with your position or mine on this issue, clearly, Members would give that office the respect that it deserves. But I just think on an issue that is important, that's controversial, whether it goes to court or not, where there are legal implications, both sides, before they cast a vote ought to get a sense of what our chief lawyer, the state's lawyer, regardless of what party that person is in, has to say about it. Because if not, I dare say that we start a precedent where the Attorney General would have a lot more time to focus on other things than giving us legal advice, because, as you know, there are many issues that come before this body, in committee or Committee of the Whole, or that are subject to end up in a court of law. And I just want to make sure that it's clear that you did not ask Attorney General not to come. So those press accounts that I have read on my BlackBerry in the last hour are apparently wrong, or there's a miscommunication there somewhere, because–

Senator Duncan: I can't believe there's any miscommunication in the world about in the media; they usually always get it right. But the, the answer to the question is, No, I did not request the Attorney General to refuse to appear.

Senator Ellis: Okay.

Senator Duncan: In fact, that's–

Senator Ellis: I would hope that if you get a call, because I'm certainly going to call. I mean, there are issues that I agree with the Attorney General on. Sometimes I may disagree, but he is my lawyer–(inaudible, overlapping conversation)

Senator Duncan: The only communication–

Senator Ellis: In the Senate.

Senator Duncan: The communication that I had with you or with Senator Van de Putte, Senator West, and others is my position on whether or not the Attorney General should appear, and that is clear as I can make it, and does state my–

Senator Ellis: I got it.

Senator Duncan: (Inaudible, overlapping conversation)

Senator Ellis: And so, for the record, I'm saying that he should come as a resource. As you know, last week when, when I was in Washington, my staff drafted a letter that I sent to our U.S. Attorney General, the initial draft said, come as a witness–

Senator Duncan: I think–
Senator Ellis: And I said, I don't think so.

Senator Duncan: Again, I'll reiterate.

Senator Ellis: He can come as a resource. So, that's what our request is, that our Attorney General be here as a resource, and not just to our side, to both sides, whether it's him or someone from his office. So, I'm hoping that that can be worked out, and, to be honest with you, I think that'd be some bipartisan agreement, does not have to come as a witness, obviously, answer questions, but be our resource. Because if not, when we have your committee meetings of State Affairs on this floor on issues that oftentimes are going to end up in litigation as soon as the bill is signed, we want the Attorney General to give us input on both sides. So, I hope that happens today. In, on the second page, page 2 under 4(a), you have witnesses appearing in order be admitted to the floor. I mentioned to you when we were huddling at the President's desk a little earlier, I think this gives you enough discretion. And if not, I want to encourage some discretion so that if one of the experts invited from either side, after they testify, if it doesn't crowd the floor--I'm sure there'll be 31 Members here most of the time--but if it doesn't crowd the floor, I hope there'll be some leniency so we don't have to have someone run back from somebody's office, below us or above us, in case there's a question, that some Member thinks of something. I mean, not to fill up the floor and not to have them create a ruckus or a demonstration, anyway, but I hope that you'll have some flexibility on that, for both sides, for expert witnesses to come in.

Senator Duncan: I will consider that as we go through. I don't think that's unreasonable. And I think that we'll, again, want to have a high quality debate on the issues.

Senator Ellis: Under Section (b), 4(b), it says that we can have one employee of the Senate within the brass rail at any given time. I'm wondering are you going to be checking the ID, or how will you know that they are employees of the Senate?

Senator Duncan: We--

Senator Ellis: Government-issued ID.

Senator Duncan: They can--

Senator Ellis: Because I wanted to make sure all my staffers did--

Senator Duncan: I--

Senator Ellis: To poke at the idea, I was talking to Chairman Williams earlier about my wife not having an ID to get in here, so I just--

Senator Duncan: The--

Senator Ellis: Wanted to make sure.

Senator Duncan: The rules of the Senate apply to that particular provision, and our staffs will be permitted if they have the green badge. And if they're on the floor, they'll have to have a green badge, other than our Sergeants, who have white badges. So, if you see a person on the floor without a green badge or a white badge, if you'll report that to the Chair or the Sergeant-at-Arms, we'll see that that is taken care of.
Senator Ellis: Well, let the record reflect that because I hope that, despite the fact that this bill can pass with a simple majority, I hope this is a deliberative process. So, anyone sitting by your desk, whether they have their ID or their green badge or their white badge, I, for one, would not object to them being here, because I want you to get all the good advice before you cast that bad vote, that you can get.

Senator Duncan: I usually–

Senator Ellis: Thank you.

Senator Duncan: Need all the advice I can get, Senator, and you usually give it to me. So, I appreciate the offer.

President: Senator West, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?

Senator West: Question of the author.

President: Will Senator Duncan yield to Senator West?

Senator Duncan: I yield.

Senator West: Senator Duncan, I'm going to follow up on some of the questions that Senator Ellis was raising as it relates to the Attorney General. Now, I think in the exchange between you and Senator Van de Putte, you said that you could not compel the Attorney General to come over and be a witness or a resource. Of the decision to not compel, invite, whatever the case may be, the Attorney General, is that a decision of the Chair is that your personal preference, or do you believe that that is the preference of the committee?

Senator Duncan: Well, I believe that the ability or authority to compel by subpoena is not granted or does not exist in the Committee of the Whole. It only exists in standing committees, and so to the extent that one would wish to compel any witness to appear before the Senate Committee of the Whole, there is no authority granted in the rules for that.

Senator West: As it relates to the rules, I mean, I thought that the resolution, or at least some iteration of something I've seen as it relates to the procedure that we would be following, would be if there was not anything specific in the resolution, then we would follow the general rules of the Senate. Is that correct?

Senator Duncan: Well, no, that's not correct, and again, I'm going to, you know, I'm not going to give advisory opinions. I think it'd be inappropriate in the resolution with–

Senator West: I'm just trying–

Senator Duncan: Regard to–

Senator West: To figure out what rules we're going to go by.

Senator Duncan: The, well, the rules are in the, in the red book and–

Senator West: Okay.

Senator Duncan: I think it's Article 13, if I remember correctly–

Senator West: Okay.
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Senator Duncan: Of the—
Senator West: Alright.
Senator Duncan: And I'm sure you've studied it.
Senator West: So, if in Rule 13, or whatever the case may be, as in terms of the Committee of the Whole, it says that we will follow the other rules of the Senate, then that's what we'll do. Is that correct?
Senator Duncan: Well, I, we'll follow the rule, and we'll—
Senator West: Okay.
Senator Duncan: Look at the rule and see what it says.
Senator West: If there's, now, let me get back to the Attorney General. Your apprehension, in terms of having the Attorney General over here, is based on a personal apprehension, or something that you claim that the committee wants to do?
Senator Duncan: Senator, as I stated, I think, to Senator Van de Putte, you know, I think any Member of the Senate or any side of this bill would be entitled to invite the Attorney General over as a witness or a resource. I think it's up to him to say yes or no on that. I don't think it's, we can compel him, in my personal opinion, I think it's always unwise if the Attorney General is going to be defending the State of Texas, or at least advancing the State of Texas' interest as expressed by this Legislature, not be a witness in the legislative debate.
Senator West: Okay. Would you go do you have your Senate Rules with you?
Senator Duncan: Probably somewhere.
Senator West: I'd ask you to look at Senate Rule 11.20, Subsection (b).
Senator Duncan: What page?
Senator West: Page 89.
Senator Duncan: Eighty-nine.
Senator West: Eighty-nine. It appears as though, if I'm reading this correctly, a Committee Chair may summon the governing board or other representative of a state agency, state agencies or an executive branch of government, to appear and testify before the committee without issuing process, that being a subpoena, under Subsection (a). The summons may be communicated in writing, orally, or electronically. Does that appear to give you the authority to do that, if you so decide to do it as the Chairman? (inaudible, overlapping conversation)
Senator Duncan: Senator, I've looked at that, and I'm familiar with that, and I don't believe that the committee, that the power to, the power to subpoena arises through the standing committees and not the Chair. This would authorize the Chair to, through the standing committees, to do that. But the Committee of the Whole in, as general, doesn't have, in my view, and I've looked at this, actually, the power to subpoena witnesses who appear before us in, in a—
Senator West: So, if—
Senator Duncan: In a committee, pure Committee of the Whole, as we're going into.
Senator West: So, if indeed there is authority to do it, would you communicate to the Attorney General the desire of the committee to appear before the committee?

Senator Duncan: Well, if the committee had, Committee of the Whole had authority to issue a subpoena, then the subpoena would have to be approved by the body, so—

Senator West: Well, this particular provision that I just mentioned is an alternative, though, to issuing a subpoena. It gives the Chair the, basically, the discretion to ask that a witness appear—

Senator Duncan: Well.

Senator West: Not by subpoenaing, just by, basically, the Chair communicating that you want him over.

Senator Duncan: Senator.

Senator West: That’s an alternative method of getting—

Senator Duncan: Well—

Senator West: Him before the committee.

Senator Duncan: Let’s look at it this way. I’m not in the Chair right now. I’m sitting out here with you, and so, it, I think it’s inappropriate for me to make a ruling out here at, in the cheap seats, so—

Senator West: Okay, but you, you will—

Senator Duncan: Uhm—

Senator West: Well, then, alright then, alright, it’s not right yet. Is that what you’re saying?

Senator Duncan: Right.

Senator West: Alright. It soon will be right. Now, let me get back then to the procedures. Would you go with me to section, Rule 13.04 on page 97.

Senator Duncan: What page?

Senator West: Ninety-seven. That rule says the rules of the Senate, as far as applicable, shall be observed in the Committee of the Whole. What’s your interpretation of that?

Senator Duncan: Well, I think that the, again, I’m not in the Chair at this point in time. I think I’ll read the rule as it states, the rules of the Senate, as far as applicable, shall be observed in Committee of the Whole—

Senator West: Okay.

Senator Duncan: Session, or Whole Senate.

Senator West: And it seems as though, to the extent that we have specificity in the resolution, and the resolution we control, and to the extent that there’s nothing in a resolution, the Senate Rules will control the procedure for the Committee of the Whole. That’s the way that I read that. How do you read it?

Senator Duncan: Senator, I’m sure we’ll have an opportunity to debate that if I’m in the Chair.
Senator West: I look forward to it. Thank you, Sir.

President: Senator Shapleigh, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?

Senator Shapleigh: Some questions of the author.

President: Will Senator Duncan yield to Senator Shapleigh?

Senator Duncan: I yield.

Senator Shapleigh: Senator, there’ve been a lot of questions about the participation of the AG and your personal feeling, obviously, prior to taking the Chair, that his testimony would present a conflict in any later litigation.

Senator Duncan: Well, Senator, that’s my personal, my personal observation is that the Attorney General should not be a witness in a legislative debate over which he will have jurisdiction to defend the position of the state at future times.

Senator Shapleigh: Would you agree that if the Attorney General undertook a rather extensive investigation of voter fraud, that that file and his findings would be relevant to the benchmark which is essential to establish, in this case, to change current procedures in the Voting Rights Act?

Senator Duncan: Senator, I, you know, I would assume that if there were public records available of that particular, any sort of effort or initiative to understand voter fraud, that those would be available to the committee, and if requested, they would be made available.

Senator Shapleigh: And if we were to subpoena him or his deputy for the purpose of bringing those records here so that we could examine them during the course of this committee, that would be relevant to our proceedings on whether or not voter fraud exists in the State of Texas?

Senator Duncan: I don’t know whether or not it would.

Senator Shapleigh: And would you agree that a Committee Chair could issue that subpoena for the purposes of the Committee of the Whole?

Senator Duncan: Senator, I, we have discussed this generally, and I think it would be inappropriate at this point in time to give you an advance, a ruling without bringing the issue formally before the body, and this would not be the right forum to do that in.

Senator Shapleigh: This proceeding is articulated in the Constitution itself, I believe in Section 16. We had some discussion of that when the special order was issued back in January, and I want to talk a little bit about the participation and your interpretation of how the Lieutenant Governor participates in the Committee of the Whole. In the Section 16, it states that the Lieutenant Governor, when in the Committee of the Whole, has the right to debate and vote on all questions. Does that right extend to amendments?

Senator Duncan: That would be an advisory opinion. We’d have to take that up at the time you wanted to raise it before the Committee of the Whole.

Senator Shapleigh: Okay. Thank you.

President: Senator Gallegos, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?
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Senator Gallegos: To ask questions of—

President: Will Senator Duncan yield—

Senator Gallegos: The author of—(inaudible, overlapping conversation)

President: To Senator Gallegos?

Senator Duncan: I yield.

Senator Gallegos: Senator Duncan, let me go back a little bit. During the redistricting process, almost 10 years ago, when I was Co-chair and Senator Fraser was Co-chair, and you oversaw the process in those redistricting hearings. Is that correct?

Senator Duncan: I was just a member of the committee in 2001.

Senator Gallegos: Okay. Well, you were a member of the committee?

Senator Duncan: Yes, Sir.

Senator Gallegos: Let me ask you this, because then, and it relates to the questions that Senator West and the initial request by Senator Van de Putte and some of the other questions as far as the process in this resolution that you have, is that whenever you take up an issue like a procedure that’s going to tell Texans how they can or cannot vote or what they must do on how to vote, and under the Voting Rights Act, like redistricting is, is that during that process that we went all over the state, had numerous public hearings and dealings with redistricting and those issues relating to redistricting, that during that process that we were allowed legal representation on both sides. Is that correct?

Senator Duncan: Senator I believe that both sides are entitled to employ at their own expense independent counsel to represent their interest or advise them in any way possible. I, I’m not at, I recall 2003 because I was directly involved in that, and I don’t recall that in that process that the Senate provided independent counsel for the party caucuses.

Senator Gallegos: But there was legal counsel present?

Senator Duncan: There was legal—

Senator Gallegos: Yes or no.

Senator Duncan: The committee employed legal counsel, correct.

Senator Gallegos: Okay. Now, on as far as the, in going back to Senator West’s inquiries, Senator Ellis’ inquiries, and this procedure on this resolution that you’re introducing right now, that when it comes to the Attorney General and that he was or his office was present at those hearings, is that yes or no?

Senator Duncan: I don’t know.

Senator Gallegos: Well, I believe it was yes, and he was there. And I guess my concern, along with Senator Ellis, Senator West, Senator Van de Putte, and the other colleagues that agree with me, is that the Attorney General is the legal representative for the citizens of the State of Texas. Is that not correct?
Senator Duncan: Senator, and let me go back to the last question you had. I don't know if they were there or not, meaning physically present or observing. I don't recall them testifying in 2003. I would, somebody might want to correct me, but I just simply don't recall it. So--

Senator Gallegos: Well--

Senator Duncan: I'm sorry, I just want to make sure you--

Senator Gallegos: Well, and--

Senator Duncan: Understand my answer.

Senator Gallegos: And you know, I, I'm trying to think back, too. I believe they were.

Senator Duncan: A lot of water's been under the bridge. A lot of--

Senator Gallegos: I mean, and what we're seeing.

Senator Duncan: Water went under the bridge during that time.

Senator Gallegos: Understand me, Senator, overseeing a process like redistricting or voter ID or anything having to do with the Texans' right to vote, under the Voting Rights Act that, yeah, I mean, it's common sense you've got to have legal counsel there, especially when you're having public testimony and allow everybody that wants to testify in front of the committee that is overseeing redistricting, voter ID, or whatever the issue is, when under the Voting Rights Act, that an attorney should be present that's going to oversee the process, like was during those hearings that we had all over the state. Now, my second question is back to the Attorney General. Now, he is the attorney for the State of Texas, and in this process that we're fixing to go through, as soon as we oversee your resolution and the procedures, is there no way, you're introducing this resolution, that you can put in there, as the Attorney General of the State of Texas overseeing Texans' rights, that either he or a representative of his office should be there and oversee Texans' rights as we, not only the resolution that you are presenting here before the floor but also that their rights be overseen? He was elected to oversee and protect us as the Attorney General of the State of Texas. I feel he should be on this floor protecting all citizens' rights whether they're for the bill or against the bill. It, I mean, but I'm asking you if you can add that to your resolution.

Senator Duncan: Senator, I guess, if you had, I mean, you can offer an amendment if you wish, but I don't intend to add that to the resolution.

Senator Gallegos: Well, wouldn't you agree with me, is he not the Attorney General of the State of Texas?

Senator Duncan: Yes, I will. I will agree with that.

Senator Gallegos: Did he not litigate the redistricting issue that we passed on this floor? And wasn't he our legal counsel in that court case?

Senator Duncan: In--

Senator Gallegos: Well, then I feel, if this is going to go to court--
Senator Duncan: What--

Senator Gallegos: He needs to be our legal counsel on this issue.

Senator Duncan: Okay.

Senator Gallegos: And then that's why I think that he should. If he doesn't show up, then he's neglecting his duties that the Attorney General of the State of Texas overseeing this emotional issue on how to tell Texans how to vote. Now, don't you agree with me that he is the Attorney General of the State of Texas and is legal counsel for the State of Texas here on, and us, on any issue that we bring up before the state, before this floor, or over in the House? Yes or no?

Senator Duncan: I don't know that I entirely agree. I think that there are certain duties that the Attorney General has that are much different from--(inaudible, overlapping conversation)

Senator Gallegos: Did he not litigate redistricting case for us?

Senator Duncan: Once we, once the state, once the Legislature approved a redistricting plan that became the law of the State of Texas, it was his duty to defend that law.

Senator Gallegos: Well, that's what I'm saying here. As soon as this becomes, if he doesn't oversee the process, he is the one that's going to oversee this process and do the litigation for us if this issue goes to court. Is that not true?

Senator Duncan: Well, I think it's our duty to pass the law, and it's his duty, then, to represent the state in court, with regard to that law.

Senator Gallegos: So, what you're telling me, you will entertain an amendment to have the Attorney General present before we lay out this bill?

Senator Duncan: No, that's not what I said. I said that if you want to offer an amendment, you can do so.

Senator Gallegos: So, you're telling--

Senator Duncan: I--

Senator Gallegos: Well, let me make this perfectly--

Senator Duncan: That I--

Senator Gallegos: Clear--

Senator Duncan: I would not vote for it, but--

Senator Gallegos: You're telling me and everybody on this Senate floor that if I or any of my colleagues produce an amendment, or at, or introduce an amendment to have the Attorney General here, that you're going to, are you going to deny me that right or any of my colleagues' rights?

Senator Duncan: Senator, is--(inaudible, overlapping conversation)

Senator Gallegos: Are you going to vote "Yes" or "No"?
SENATOR DUNCAN: When you call it up, I will, I would prefer the amendment or the resolution to go through as I have proposed it.

SENATOR GALLEGOS: Thank you, Senator.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

HOUSE CHAMBER
Austin, Texas
March 10, 2009

The Honorable President of the Senate
Senate Chamber
Austin, Texas

Mr. President:

I am directed by the House to inform the Senate that the House has taken the following action:

THE HOUSE HAS PASSED THE FOLLOWING MEASURES:

HCR 80, Recognizing March 2009 as National Women's History Month.
HCR 85, Declaring March 10, 2009, as Matagorda County Day at the State Capitol.
HCR 87, Declaring March 10, 2009, Brazoria County Day at the State Capitol.
SCR 30, In memory of Jess M. Irwin, Jr.

Respectfully,
/s/Robert Haney, Chief Clerk
House of Representatives

SENATE RESOLUTION 205

Senator Ogden offered the following resolution:

WHEREAS, The Senate of the State of Texas is pleased to recognize the Boys and Girls Clubs of Texas for the valuable contribution they make to the young people of this state; and

WHEREAS, Boys and Girls Clubs provide services to over 418,000 school-aged young people in 172 cities in Texas; their goal is to inspire all young people, especially those who need it most, to realize their full potential as productive, responsible, and caring citizens; and

WHEREAS, Through strong, evidence-based, and proven-effective youth development programs, leaders in the Boys and Girls Clubs stress character and leadership development, education and career advancement, and health and life skills; they encourage an appreciation for the arts and provide programs in sports, fitness, and recreation; and

WHEREAS, The programs promote a better self-image and improved educational, social, emotional, and cultural awareness while encouraging community involvement, strong moral values, and enhanced life management skills; and

WHEREAS, On March 10, 2009, one of eight finalists from Texas will be chosen as Texas State Youth of the Year to represent the State of Texas in the National Youth of the Year contest for Boys and Girls Clubs of America; and
WHEREAS, Through the years, Boys and Girls Clubs have encouraged young people to aspire to the highest level of personal development and to become good citizens who are involved in their communities; now, therefore, be it
RESOLVED, That the Senate of the State of Texas, 81st Legislature, hereby commend Boys and Girls Clubs across Texas for the outstanding services they provide young people and their families; and, be it further
RESOLVED, That a copy of this Resolution be prepared for the organization as an expression of high regard from the Texas Senate.

SR 205 was read and was adopted without objection.

SENATE RESOLUTION 307

Senator Huffman offered the following resolution:

WHEREAS, Proud citizens from Brazoria County are coming to Austin on March 10, 2009, to celebrate Brazoria County Day at the Texas State Capitol, and this occasion provides an opportunity to pay tribute to this important region of the Lone Star State; and
WHEREAS, Located along the Gulf Coast, Brazoria County has been blessed with 20 miles of natural beach; encompassing both the Brazoria and San Bernard National Wildlife Refuges, this notable Texas county boasts spectacular flora and fauna as well as excellent opportunities for hunting and fishing; and
WHEREAS, Before being settled by members of Stephen F. Austin's "Old 300" colonists in the early 1820s, this geographically diverse region was inhabited by members of the Karankawa tribe; officially created in 1836, the county was the site of General Santa Anna's signing of the Treaties of Velasco that same year, which effectively granted Texas its independence; and
WHEREAS, Angleton, the county seat, was founded in 1890 and today is an award-winning Keep Texas Beautiful city which offers visitors a host of interesting attractions, including antique shops, parks, and the Brazoria County Historical Museum; the town's annual events include the Brazoria County Fair and Christmas on the Square; and
WHEREAS, The populous Brazosport area is home to more than 58,000 people who live in eight adjacent cities: Clute, Freeport, Jones Creek, Lake Jackson, Oyster Creek, Quintana, Richwood, and Surfside Beach; Brazosport's diverse economy includes chemical processing, shipping via its deepwater seaport, commercial fishing, and tourism; other sizable cities in Brazoria County include Alvin, the hometown of Baseball Hall of Famer Nolan Ryan, and Pearland, a center for the chemical and oil industries; and
WHEREAS, From the pioneer era to the present, Brazoria County has been home to industrious and innovative citizens, and their many contributions to the Lone Star State are truly worthy of recognition; now, therefore, be it
RESOLVED, That the Senate of the 81st Texas Legislature hereby recognize March 10, 2009, as Brazoria County Day at the State Capitol and extend a warm welcome to the citizens who have traveled to Austin to celebrate this occasion.

HUFFMAN
JACKSON

SR 307 was read and was adopted without objection.
SENATE RESOLUTION 284

Senator Jackson offered the following resolution:

WHEREAS, The Senate of the State of Texas is pleased to recognize the Brazoria County Cavalry for its impressive support of the men and women of the armed forces, veterans, police officers, fire fighters, and emergency service responders; and

WHEREAS, Composed of more than 400 motorcyclists from Southeast Texas, the Brazoria County Cavalry provides gratitude and respect to those who serve our state and nation in military and public service; and

WHEREAS, The members of this exceptional organization show their dedication to those who serve by appearing in force at the homecoming of soldiers and at funerals of the fallen, offering support and admiration in times both joyful and solemn; and

WHEREAS, The members of the Brazoria County Cavalry put aside their own interests in the wake of Hurricane Ike to help repair and rebuild a fence in Angleton decorated with crosses representing each soldier killed in Iraq and Afghanistan; their generosity and pride of service embodies the ideals of our state and nation; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Senate of the State of Texas, 81st Legislature, hereby commend the members of the Brazoria County Cavalry on their dedication to the men and women who serve our state and nation and extend to them gratitude and appreciation for their devotion and service; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That a copy of this Resolution be prepared for this outstanding organization as an expression of esteem from the Texas Senate.

JACKSON
HUFFMAN

SR 284 was read and was adopted without objection.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING CALL

The President at 11:55 a.m. announced the conclusion of morning call.

AT EASE

The President at 11:56 a.m. announced the Senate would stand At Ease subject to the call of the Chair.

IN LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The President at 12:35 p.m. called the Senate to order as In Legislative Session.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE SENATE

The President at 12:35 p.m. announced that the Senate would resolve into the Committee of the Whole Senate with President Pro Tempore Duncan presiding.

IN LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The President called the Senate to order at 9:29 a.m. Wednesday, March 11, 2009, as In Legislative Session.
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE SENATE REPORT

Senator Duncan was recognized and reported that the Committee of the Whole Senate had met and reported SB 362 to the Senate with the recommendation that it do pass and be printed.

MOTION IN WRITING

Senator Fraser offered the following Motion In Writing:

Mr. President:

I move that SB 362, relating to voter identification requirements, be made a special order for Monday, March 16, 2009, and thereafter until disposed of on second and third readings.

FRASER

The motion prevailed by the following vote: Yeas 19, Nays 12.

Yeas: Averitt, Carona, Deuell, Duncan, Eltife, Estes, Fraser, Harris, Hegar, Huffman, Jackson, Nelson, Nichols, Ogden, Patrick, Seliger, Shapiro, Wentworth, Williams.


SENATE RESOLUTION 410

Senator Lucio offered the following resolution:

WHEREAS Proud residents of the Mid-Valley region of Texas are gathering in Austin on March 11, 2009, to celebrate Mid-Valley Day at the State Capitol; and

WHEREAS, Located in the Rio Grande Valley, the Mid-Valley region includes the towns of Alamo, Donna, Mercedes, Progreso, Progreso Lakes, San Juan, and Weslaco; this area is a center for agribusiness, with farmers producing sugarcane, grains, and citrus fruit such as grapefruits and oranges; and

WHEREAS, The City of Alamo has been undertaking a far-reaching revitalization plan that has resulted in the construction of a new city hall, public library, and public works center; in addition, the town is making significant improvements to its infrastructure and fire department and police facilities; and

WHEREAS, Upholding the motto "the City with a Heart in the Heart of the Rio Grande Valley," Donna looks forward to the completion of the Donna International Bridge to Mexico; the eight-lane bridge is expected to bolster the city's economy because of the increased number of shoppers and tourists traveling to and from Mexico; and

WHEREAS, Mercedes has long been a major center for the processing and marketing of livestock, cotton, and vegetables, and it is also known for its boot makers and the shopping opportunities at the Rio Grande Valley Premium Outlets; the annual Rio Grande Valley Livestock Show and Rodeo draws more than 200,000 people to town each year, and the event provides valuable scholarship funds for 4-H and Future Farmers of America students; and

WHEREAS, In addition to being centers for the sugarcane business, Progreso and Progreso Lakes have been serving as gateways to the Rio Grande Valley since the opening of the Progreso-Nuevo Progreso International Bridge in 2003; and
WHEREAS, Fast-growing San Juan is the home of the Virgen de San Juan del Valle Shrine, which attracts multitudes of pilgrims from throughout the United States and Mexico, and the town has also installed a landmark flagpole that pays tribute to the men and women who have served in the nation's armed forces; and

WHEREAS, The City of Weslaco has become a favorite destination for tourists, golfers, retirees, and birders and is the location of two important Texas A&M University research stations; the annual Onion Fest celebrates the development of the famous Texas 1015 onion in Weslaco, and this popular event brings many visitors to the city; and

WHEREAS, Throughout the Mid-Valley region, great emphasis is placed on the value of education, and one particularly striking example of the Mid-Valley's educational achievements came in December of 2008, when *U.S. News & World Report* ranked the Science Academy of South Texas in Mercedes among the nation's top 100 high schools; and

WHEREAS, The residents of this dynamic region of the Lone Star State are justifiably proud of their hard work, civic commitment, and innovative spirit, and their efforts have created a group of notable Texas communities that are well prepared to meet the challenges and opportunities of the future; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Senate of the State of Texas, 81st Legislature, hereby recognize March 11, 2009, as Mid-Valley Day at the State Capitol and extend to the visiting delegation best wishes for an informative and enjoyable stay in Austin.

SR 410 was read and was adopted without objection.

GUESTS PRESENTED

Senator Lucio was recognized and introduced to the Senate Mid-Valley region Mayors Omar Vela, Pedro Contreras, Rudy Villarreal, Joel Quintanilla, and Buddy de la Rosa, accompanied by a delegation of citizens from the Mid-Valley region.

The Senate welcomed its guests.

RESOLUTION SIGNED

The President announced the signing of the following enrolled resolution in the presence of the Senate: SCR 30.

SENATE RESOLUTION 409

Senator Uresti offered the following resolution:

WHEREAS, The Senate of the State of Texas is pleased to join the citizens of Uvalde County and Texans across the state in celebrating March 11, 2009, as Uvalde County Day at the State Capitol; and

WHEREAS, Created by the Texas Legislature in the mid-1850s out of territory from Bexar County, Uvalde County was named for the Spanish governor of Coahuila, Juan de Ugalde, who had led troops to a decisive victory over Apache warriors in 1790; and

WHEREAS, The City of Uvalde is the county seat; founded by Reading W. Black in the 1850s, it is known for its four public plazas and its picturesque architecture; and
WHEREAS, Uvalde County was home to Garner Army Air Field during World War II; the former airfield is now the site of Southwest Texas Junior College; and
WHEREAS, Known as the County of 1,000 Springs, Uvalde County is also a center for wool and mohair production, and its agricultural output plays a major role in the county’s economy; and
WHEREAS, The citizens of Uvalde County are justly proud of its long and distinguished history and the many achievements its citizens have made to further the growth and progress of our state; now, therefore, be it
RESOLVED, That the Senate of the State of Texas, 81st Legislature, hereby commend the citizens of Uvalde County on their many contributions to our state and extend to them a heartfelt welcome to Austin for Uvalde County Day at the State Capitol; and, be it further
RESOLVED, That a copy of this Resolution be prepared in honor of this special day.

SR 409 was read and was adopted without objection.

GUESTS PRESENTED

Senator Uresti was recognized and introduced to the Senate representatives of Uvalde County: Uvalde Mayor Cody Smith, County Commissioner Jesse Moreno, County Attorney John P. Dodson, Sheriff Charles Mendeké, and Uvalde Mayor Pro Tempore Raul T. Flores, accompanied by a delegation of citizens from Uvalde County.

The Senate welcomed its guests.

SENATE RESOLUTION 412

Senator Zaffirini offered the following resolution:

WHEREAS, On March 11, 2009, people from across Atascosa County are traveling to the State Capitol to celebrate their community’s heritage and to share with fellow Texans their history, traditions, and achievements; and
WHEREAS, The name Atascosa, derived from the Spanish word for boggy terrain, was used to describe the area as early as 1788; during the first part of the 19th century, this grassy prairie region of South Texas attracted Spanish, Mexican, and Anglo-American settlers, and by the time of the Texas Revolution, its ranching industry was flourishing; and
WHEREAS, In 1856, the region was sufficiently populated to be sectioned off from Bexar County; the original county seat at Navatasco was later permanently moved to the centrally located town of Jourdanton; and
WHEREAS, Situated next to the famous Camino Real, the county has long benefited from its proximity to major transportation arteries linking it with the Gulf Coast, the Rio Grande Valley, and Mexico, as well as other major population centers; and
WHEREAS, Atascosa County enjoys the economic benefits reaped by an abundance of natural resources and, blessed with productive range and irrigated farmland, the area is known for its farming and ranching industries; and
WHEREAS, Proud of its ranching heritage, Pleasanton, the county’s trading center, bills itself as the birthplace of the cowboy, a designation symbolized by a large bronze statue in front of city hall; in nearby Poteet, known to many as the Strawberry Capital of the World, a seven-foot, 1,600-pound monument to the fruit graces the front lawn of city hall, and a Strawberry Festival, the fourth-largest agricultural festival in the state, takes place in April; and

WHEREAS, Other resources such as oil and gas also play a significant role in the county’s ongoing development, but the most important asset in the area’s increasingly diverse economy is undoubtedly its industrious citizenry; and

WHEREAS, For more than a century, residents of Atascosa County have contributed to the economic and cultural development of Texas, and they are justifiably proud of their rich history; it is indeed appropriate that they be honored on this day; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Senate of the State of Texas, 81st Legislature, hereby recognize March 11, 2009, as Atascosa County Day at the State Capitol and extend a warm welcome to all visitors from that fine county.

SR 412 was read and was adopted without objection.

GUESTS PRESENTED

Senator Zaffirini was recognized and introduced to the Senate Diana J. Bautista, Atascosa County Judge; Lon Gillespie, County Commissioner; Diane Gonzales, County Clerk; Michael Lambaria, Veterans County Service Officer; and Roger Garza, Pleasanton City Councilmember.

The Senate welcomed its guests.

SENATE RESOLUTION 411

Senator Lucio offered the following resolution:

WHEREAS, Kingsville is truly an "All American City," having been founded on the Fourth of July in 1905; and

WHEREAS, Kingsville is home to the world-famous King Ranch, which developed the Santa Gertrudis and Quarter Horse breeds, produced the Triple Crown winner Assault, and has been a world leader in agriculture for over 150 years; and

WHEREAS, Kingsville is home to Texas A&M University–Kingsville and its world renowned Frank H. Dotterweich College of Engineering, Dick and Mary Lewis Kleberg College of Agriculture, Caesar Kleberg Wildlife Research Institute, and Irma Rangel College of Pharmacy; and

WHEREAS, The city is also known for producing the Star Ruby red grapefruit and its university has won seven National College Football Championships and has been the flagship of higher education in South Texas since 1925; and

WHEREAS, Kingsville is home to the nation’s premier undergraduate pilot training facility, Naval Air Station Kingsville, which trains pilots in the United States Navy and Marine Corps; and

WHEREAS, Kingsville has volunteered its sons and daughters in defense of our nation through every major conflict in the past 100 years, including native son General Dickie Cavazos, the first person of Mexican-American descent to become a four star general in the United States Army; and
WHEREAS, Kingsville today is a thriving community with diversified industries powered by multiple energy sources, including oil and gas, uranium, and wind and solar power; and

WHEREAS, Kingsville’s economy has continued to grow, creating new jobs, increased construction, an expanded tax base, and improved quality of life; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Senate of the State of Texas, 81st Legislature, hereby declare March 11, 2009, to be Kingsville Day and urge all citizens of this state to join in recognizing the countless contributions that the City of Kingsville and Kleberg and Kenedy Counties have made to the growth and development of the region, the state, and the country; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That a copy of this Resolution be prepared in honor of this special day.

SR 411 was read and was adopted without objection.

GUESTS PRESENTED

Senator Lucio was recognized and introduced to the Senate Kleberg County Judge Pete De La Garza, accompanied by a delegation of citizens from Kleberg County.

The Senate welcomed its guests.

RESOLUTIONS OF RECOGNITION

The following resolutions were adopted by the Senate:

Memorial Resolutions

SR 401 by Nelson, In memory of Vyarl Wayne Martin of Hurst.

SR 407 by Ellis, In memory of John Cleveland Hooper of Columbus, Mississippi.

SR 413 by Zaffirini, In memory of María Rosa Ramírez of Laredo.

Congratulatory Resolutions

SR 398 by Nichols, Congratulating Jean Paul Destarac of Tyler for being named a Distinguished Finalist by the Prudential Spirit of Community Awards program.

SR 399 by Nichols, Congratulating Russell Frautschi and Katie Stark of Athens High School for advancing to the state University Interscholastic League debate competition.

SR 402 by Nelson, Congratulating Jim McDermott for receiving a 2009 Lifetime Achievement Award for Staff Leadership from the National Council for Community Behavioral Healthcare.

SR 403 by Nelson, Recognizing Richard Stephen Kitchen on the occasion of his retirement from the North Richland Hills Police Department.

SR 404 by Nelson, Recognizing Theresa Bilger on the occasion of her retirement from the North Richland Hills Police Department.

SR 405 by Deuell, Congratulating Patrick Foster of Sachse for being honored by the Prudential Spirit of Community Awards program.
SR 414 by Shapiro, Recognizing Von William Byer for his work in Senator Shapiro's office.

SR 415 by Shapiro, Recognizing Tara Korstad for her work in Senator Shapiro's office.

Official Designation Resolution

SR 400 by Nichols, Recognizing April 10, 2009, as Texas Folklore Society Day.

RECESS

On motion of Senator Whitmire, the Senate at 9:54 a.m. recessed until 10:00 a.m. Friday, March 13, 2009.

APPENDIX

BILL ENGROSSED

March 9, 2009
SB 643

RESOLUTIONS ENROLLED

March 9, 2009

SENT TO SECRETARY OF STATE

March 10, 2009
SCR 36

SENT TO GOVERNOR

March 10, 2009
SCR 18, SCR 29, SCR 31
March 11, 2009
SCR 30
My name is Judith Sanders-Castro. I am an attorney who has practiced in the area of Voting Rights litigation for almost three decades. I have served as the State Legal Counsel for LULAC in the past, represented LULAC in Voting Rights litigation and testified before this legislature on behalf of LULAC concerning changes in election practices and procedures. I am here at the request of the National President, Rosa Rosales.

My comments are presented on behalf of the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) and the national president, Rosa Rosales. President Rosales and LULAC have been at the forefront of challenging discriminatory election practices and systems for the past three decades in Texas. At all levels, LULAC has advocated for increased access for minority populations to the voting and electoral processes and engaged in legal challenges to discriminatory laws, practices and procedures in Austin and throughout the state. The bills before this committee today, HB 101, HB 210, and HB 625, present some of the most onerous restrictions for minority voters in Texas seen in half a century.

The State of Texas has a bleak history of burdening the rights of people of color to vote. In 1966, the U.S. Supreme Court declared that a poll tax to vote violated the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment in Harper v. Virginia Board of Elections. Subsequently, Texas had the questionable distinction of being among the last four states to maintain a poll tax for voting. Even after the poll tax had been declared an unconstitutional burden on the right to vote by the Supreme Court, Texas only changed the requirement after being ordered to do so by a federal court in a later action declaring the poll tax unconstitutional.

Today, the legislature proposes again severely burdening the rights of people in Texas to register to vote and participate in the voting process. The bills before this committee, HB 101, HB 210, and HB 625, create a process of registration that retrogresses from the postcard registration available for residents of Texas for decades. Calling for presentation of photo identification and other governmental documents information in order to register to vote completely eviscerates the current open and liberalized system of voter registration in Texas. The identification requirements for voting place unnecessary obstacles to the most fundamental of rights, the right to vote.

Essentially, these bills will require a re-registration of voters in Texas and make initial registration for new or first time voters a logistical nightmare. The state will reduce the location for voter registration to a few locations throughout the state, the Department of Public Safety offices for driver’s license applications. Deputy registrars will not be able to conduct field registration; voter registration drives like those conducted by Southwest
Voter Registration Project that has worked for decades to increase the Hispanic voter registration in our state, will not be possible because the new law requires on-site registration at limited locations.

Access to the registration sites, without significant expansion of locations with accompanying personnel, will pose the greatest burdens on poor and minority populations. None of the major cities in the state have a viable public transportation system, and those that exist provide limited service making use of the systems costly, time consuming and extraordinarily inefficient. In Texas, being poor equates with being people of color, Hispanics and African Americans. People of color are less likely to have personal transportation and much more likely to use public transportation than the Anglo population. Access to the voter registration sites alone will significantly discourage voter registration for these populations.

As several speakers have noted, there are many groups who will have difficulty with the changed requirements, producing the kind of government-issued identification required by these bills in order to register to vote or to vote. Of all the groups identified, for the reasons set forth in these comments, i.e. lower socio-economic status of minority populations, people of color will be the most heavily impacted group, reducing registration rates and voter participation rates of Hispanics and African Americans more than any other identified group.

It is not accidental that these changes have been proposed as the decennial census approaches and statistics show that the minority populations, particularly the Hispanic population, have been the growth in Texas over the past decade. It is not accidental as, on the tail of the 2008 elections, the magnificent increase of the number of elected Hispanic and African American officials have swept through the metropolitan areas of Texas is followed by state efforts to suppress minority participation in the electoral process.

The effect of these bills and the burdensome changes in voter registration and electoral participation is entirely foreseeable. These changes are undeniably aimed at the swelling increase of minority participation in the political processes in Texas over the past few decades. The changes are retrogressive and intended to discriminate against minority populations. As such, these changes will violate constitutional protections for minority voters and those afforded under the federal Voting Rights Act.
Some Thoughts On

The Proposed Texas

Photo-ID Bill.
The first Consideration should be whether there is a problem with persons who vote multiple times—of non-citizens voting for that matter. Everyone agrees that there are no documented cases where either of these has been done on any large scale in recent years. Many people refer to the Box 13 in Duval County during the Coke Stevenson vs Lyndon Johnson election in 1948. That was 59 years ago.

It is a serious violation of law to vote multiple times. While there have been a limited number of charges of multiple voting, nothing on any large scale. The limited interest by District Attorneys indicates that there is no ground swell of support from the law enforcement community.

On these two grounds alone, the Photo ID bill ought to be rejected.
3. Nor would one expect that would be a large problem here. Multiple voting is not a very efficient way to commit fraud in an election. For example if you had 50 people who were willing to vote multiple times and they were able to get to 5 different voting precincts in one election day, you would have 250 votes.

4. Only very small city and school board elections would be affected by this level of fraud. Obviously in a small city or school district everyone knows everyone and this would be impossible.

Besides any criminal attorney will tell you that a conspiracy—which is what this would be-- works only if there a limited number of conspirators. 50 is not a limited number.
The Next Question is Who is Burdened by a Photo ID requirement—Who is Likely Not to Have a Driver’s License?

5. Everyone agrees that the elderly would be burdened and that those who do not have cars. This means the elderly poor and the poor in general.

6. the poverty and lower income rate is significantly higher among Hispanics and African American, they are less likely to have a vehicle and a Driver’s License. And therefore more likely to obtain an Identity card.

7. Studies indicate a strong correlation between
   ✓ Race/ethnicity and car ownership
   ✓ Income and car ownership
   ✓ Education and Car Ownership
For Example:

“For all whites in our sample, 76 percent own cars, compared with 47 percent of blacks, and 52 percent of Latinos. Moreover, within educational attainment categories whites have higher (and statistically distinguishable) car ownership rates than do blacks and Latinos. For example, 51 percent of whites with less than 12 years of education own cars, compared with 28 percent of blacks and 44 percent of Latinos with comparable educations. Similarly, among individuals with 16 plus years of schooling, 87 percent of whites, 71 percent of blacks, and 64 percent of Latinos own cars.”

Can Boosting Minority Car-Ownership Rates Narrow Inter-Racial Employment Gaps? Steven Raphael Goldman School of Public Policy University of California, Berkeley raphael@socrates.berkeley.edu Michael Stoll School of Public Policy and Social Research University of California, Los Angeles mstoll@ucla.edu June 2000
Consider These Studies

Correlating Income, Education and Race/Ethnicity in the Context of the 2000 Census
25% of Minority Texans Live in Poverty

Persons by Race and Ethnicity Below Poverty

State of Texas

Hispanic 25.4%
Af.Am. 23.4%
Anglo 7.8%
More than half of Hispanics have not graduated from high school.
Anglos Make Up Almost 75% of Texans With Graduate or Professional Degrees

Percent of Persons 25+ With Graduate or Professional Degrees

10.0% Hispanic
6.6% Af.Am.
74.3% Anglo
8. This racial/ethnic differential in income increases with age. For example, Hispanics and African Americans tend to rely almost entirely on Social Security for retirement income.
9. Next consider these facts on poverty and income in the context of how does one obtain a Photo ID of one does not drive.

10. The location of places where the identification card is available has been mapped out for 4 counties. The number of locations is limited and in most cases not within the traditional minority area. Given the differential in income identified in the charts, the burden of travel would fall most heavily on the minority persons.

11. In urban areas it is not unusual to take more than an hour of waiting to get a license or renewal. One of my friends recounts that recently he went with his daughter to pick up her first driver's license. He timed it and it took just over 45 minutes. He drove to the DPS registration office and that took 26 minutes.

12. But he is an attorney and has a car. I am familiar with the urban bus systems in Texas. Had he taken the bus with waiting and transfer times, the travel time would likely have been more in the neighborhood of an hour each way.
13. He told me that persons in line ahead of he and his daughter were turned away because they did not have all of the documents required. One of the biggest problems seemed to be in producing a Social Security card. I received my paper Social Security card many years ago. It has long since disintegrated. I know the number but it is never necessary to have the actual card. In fact I recall that on my card it specifically said not for identification.
I would not carry a social security card with me specifically to guard against identity theft. Besides, it is difficult to imagine why a Social Security number would be necessary to issue and identification card or a driver's license.

Then there is the problem with how difficult will it be to obtain an identity card. The Locations of where to get this card follow.

Note how inconvenient these offices are to the minority population of our largest cities. Again consider the burden of transportation.

Obtaining an identity card would be a full day process.

Recall that the poll tax was Unconstitutional not because of the cost—although that was certainly a problem. It was because the poll tax discouraged minority registration and hence voting.
According to the DPS Website, there are no places to obtain a Identity Card within Loop 610 in Harris County. This is probably the greatest minority concentration in the state.
According to the DPS Website, there are no places to obtain a Identity Card within IH 820 in Tarrant County
According to the DPS Website, there is only one place in inner-city Dallas to obtain an Identity Card. This is clearly the second largest concentration of minority population in the state.
This is an example of a fairly large rural area in Frio County where the second largest town in the county is about 15 miles from the Pearsal Driver License Office.
14. Obviously, the locations make it more difficult for minority Texans to participate in the political process.

15. Let's think again about the social security number.

16. Recall that in one of the first Voting Rights Section 5 Objections, Texas was specifically restrained from requiring a social security number connected with voter registration.

17. In order to obtain a Texas Identification card, the applicant must fill out a form. Some years ago Texas passed a statute that required that persons re-register on forms that would be sent to them. Because of the differential in literacy and education, the Department of Justice was concerned and issued another Section 5 Objection. The earlier charts show that this level of differential in literacy and education still exists.
18. There are some documents that can be used in lieu of presenting a photo id. These include a letter or a bill in the voter's name and addressed to him/her from a Federal or a state agency. These sorts of notices have been substantially reduced with the advent of direct deposit. Many times several families or parts of families will live in the same house or in smaller houses on the same lot. The bills would likely be addressed to only one of the persons living there
19. One of the arguments that has been advanced is that the Department of Justice will certainly approve (preclear) this photo id bill because the Courts have approved such a bill in a few other states and there was no Section 5 Voting Rights Objection to a similar law recently passed in Georgia.

20. To begin with, Texas had a poll tax which was invalidated by the Courts. The state then passed an annual registration bill that was stricken as unconstitutional with the observation by the Court that it was more restrictive than the poll tax. The legislature then passed a biannual registration bill that was also stricken by the Federal Courts as too restrictive. Texas then passed a permanent voter registration bill. However a few years later the state passed a purge and re-registration requirement that was invalidated by a Voting Rights Objection.

21. Another differential with Georgia is the sheer size of Texas. The minority population of just Harris County is as large as the minority population of Georgia. And most of that population is crowded into the area within Loop 610 where there is not a single place to obtain a Texas Identification card.

22. I suspect that if there were no convenient places for the minority population in Georgia to get the identification cards, there would have been no preclearance.
**Compare Minority Population of Harris County With That of the 50 States**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>African-American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>3,257,464</td>
<td>1,321,348</td>
<td>955,454</td>
<td>980,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>12,403,628</td>
<td>5,094,282</td>
<td>1,792,064</td>
<td>5,565,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>18,274,457</td>
<td>6,014,385</td>
<td>2,847,583</td>
<td>5,881,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>15,982,374</td>
<td>5,315,921</td>
<td>2,687,713</td>
<td>5,016,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>10,823,281</td>
<td>3,325,982</td>
<td>1,759,145</td>
<td>3,738,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78,518,936</td>
<td>25,443,062</td>
<td>9,006,607</td>
<td>44,069,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris County</td>
<td>3,454,566</td>
<td>1,283,900</td>
<td>1,132,322</td>
<td>1,038,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1,228,274</td>
<td>545,325</td>
<td>110,105</td>
<td>572,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>3,828,513</td>
<td>1,722,945</td>
<td>778,946</td>
<td>1,326,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>5,356,396</td>
<td>1,479,141</td>
<td>2,773,016</td>
<td>1,103,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>2,238,444</td>
<td>1,157,332</td>
<td>329,877</td>
<td>746,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>2,894,048</td>
<td>928,657</td>
<td>530,686</td>
<td>1,434,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>1,282,082</td>
<td>480,602</td>
<td>128,347</td>
<td>673,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>2,251,430</td>
<td>1,153,932</td>
<td>717,132</td>
<td>374,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78,518,936</td>
<td>25,443,062</td>
<td>9,006,607</td>
<td>44,069,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78,518,936</td>
<td>25,443,062</td>
<td>9,006,607</td>
<td>44,069,267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Harris County has virtually the same Minority Population as the Entire State of Georgia**

**Dallas County has a Larger Minority Population than South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi and Alaska**

Compiled 2000 Census for States