

>> ALL RISE.
HEAR YE, HEAR YE, HEAR YE, THE
SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA IS NOW
IN SESSION.
ALL WHO HAVE CAUSE TO PLEA, DRAW
NEAR, GIVE ATTENTION.
YOU SHALL BE HEARD.
GOD SAVE THESE UNITED STATES,
THE GREAT STATE OF FLORIDA AND
THIS HONORABLE COURT.
>> LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, THE
SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA.
PLEASE BE SEATED.
>> GOOD MORNING.
WELCOME TO THE FLORIDA SUPREME
COURT.
THE FIRST CASE ON THE DOCKET
THIS MORNING WILL BE THE
ADVISORY OPINION TO THE ATTORNEY
GENERAL.
SIR?
>> GOOD MORNING, MR. CHIEF
JUSTICE, AND MAY IT PLEASE THE
COURT, MY NAME IS AMIT AGARWAL.
I'M APPEARING ON BEHALF OF THE
ATTORNEY GENERAL.
WE'RE HERE THIS MORNING ON THE
ATTORNEY GENERAL'S PETITION FOR
AN ADVISORY OPINION CONCERNING A
BALLOT INITIATIVE ENTITLED
VOTING RESTORATION AMENDMENT.
ONLY ONE PARTY WILL BE
PRESENTING ARGUMENT THIS
MORNING.
MR. JON L. MILLS WILL ARGUE IN
SUPPORT OF BALLOT PLACEMENT ON
BEHALF OF THE INITIATIVE'S
SPONSOR, FLORIDIANS FOR A FAIR
DEMOCRACY.
THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
>> HAS THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
TAKEN A POSITION ON THIS?
>> NO, YOUR HONOR.
>> ALL RIGHT.
THANK YOU.
>> MAY IT PLEASE THE COURT, MY
NAME IS JON MILLS, COUNSEL FOR
THE PROPONENT.
JOINING ME AT COUNSELOR TABLE IS
ANDREW STARLING.

THE MISSION OF THE COURT IN REVIEWING OF INITIATIVES IS ONE OVERARCHING ISSUE, AND THAT IS PRESENTING A FAIR QUESTION TO THE VOTERS OF FLORIDA.

THAT QUESTION IS DIRECTED TO THE COURT IN TWO PARTS.

FIRST IS THE INITIATIVE, DOES IT CONSTITUTE A SINGLE SUBJECT.

AND SECONDLY, IS THE TITLE AND SUMMARY A CLEAR EXPLANATION OF THE OVERALL PURPOSE OF THE INITIATIVE.

THE SINGLE SUBJECT IS DIVIDED INTO TWO PARTS ITSELF; THAT IS, IS THE INITIATIVE, DOES IT CONSTITUTE LOG ROLLING.

THAT IS, PUTTING TOGETHER TWO DISPARATE ISSUES IN ORDER TO TRY TO ENCOURAGE VOTERS UNFAIRLY TO VOTE FOR A PROPOSITION, SAY IF A PROPOSITION INCLUDED INCREASING SENTENCES FOR DRUG DEALERS AND INCREASING SALARIES FOR TEACHERS.

THOSE ARE DISPARATE SUBJECTS THAT SHOULDN'T BE PUT TOGETHER.

THE SECOND COMPONENT OF THE SINGLE SUBJECT RULE IS DOES THE PROPOSAL HAVE A SUBSTANTIAL IMPACT ON MULTIPLE FUNCTIONS OF GOVERNMENT WHICH, AGAIN, WOULD CREATE AN UNFAIR QUESTION.

IN THE PAST, AN EXAMPLE OF THIS WAS AN ALLOCATION OF 40% OF GENERAL REVENUE TO EDUCATION.

AND THE CONSEQUENCE OF THAT WOULD BE TO HAVE AN IMPACT ON MULTIPLE FUNCTIONS OF GOVERNMENT.

THIS INITIATIVE IS RATHER NARROW.

IT ACTUALLY SIMPLY PROVIDES THAT, RESTORES THE RIGHT TO INDIVIDUALS WITH FELONY CONVICTIONS EXCLUDING CONVICTIONS FOR MURDER AND FELONY SEXUAL OFFENSES UPON THE COMPLETION OF ALL TERMS OF THE CRIMINAL OFFENSE.

>> SO LET ME JUST ASK YOU THIS,
THAT MEANS THAT-- EXCUSE ME.
THE CONVICTED PERSON WOULD NOT
HAVE TO DO ANYTHING ABOUT
RESTORING RIGHTS.

THIS WOULD BE AN AUTOMATIC
PROVISION.

ARE THERE OTHER RIGHTS THEY
WOULD HAVE TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT
TO HAVE RESTORED?

>> THIS ONLY RELATES TO VOTING.
SO IT DOESN'T RESTORE THE RIGHT
TO HOLD OFFICE, DOESN'T RESTORE
THE RIGHT TO BE ON A JURY OR TO
OWN A GUN.

SO IT'S SIMPLY VOTING.

A VERY GOOD EXPLANATION OF THE
PROCESS WAS DONE BY THE FISCAL
FINANCIAL ESTIMATING CONFERENCE
THAT WENT THROUGH SPECIFICALLY
HOW THIS WOULD WORK IN
COMPARISON TO HOW IT WORKS NOW.
IF YOU ARE REGISTERING TO VOTE,
YOU GO TO THE SUPERVISOR OF
ELECTIONS, AND YOU FILL OUT A
FORM.

ONE OF THE ISSUES ON THAT FORM
IS DO YOU HAVE A FELONY
CONVICTION.

SO NOW, GIVEN IF THIS PASSES, IT
WOULD HAVE DO YOU HAVE A FELONY
CONVICTION AND HAVE YOU
FULFILLED ALL TERMS OF THE
SENTENCE.

AND AT THAT POINT, THE
SUPERVISORS OF ELECTION SEND
THOSE FORMS TO THE SECRETARY OF
STATE WHO VERIFIES IT.

SO IT'S, THAT PROCESS DOES NOT
CHANGE, AND THE PROCESS
STATEWIDE WOULD BE IDENTICAL.

SO IT DOESN'T, AS THE FISCAL
IMPACT CONFERENCE SAID, IT
DOESN'T CHANGE THE STATUTORY
PROCESS AT ALL.

>> WELL, IT WOULD PROBABLY JUST
FROM THE FINANCIAL PART SINCE
THERE WAS ALL OF THIS EFFORT
SEVERAL YEARS AGO TO MAKE SURE
ALL FELONS WERE REMOVED FROM THE

ROLE, SO THIS WOULD BE ANYONE WANTING TO VOTE WOULD HAVE TO AFFIRMATIVELY--

>> YES.

>>-- REAPPLY.

>> THAT'S RIGHT.

IT DOES, THERE ISN'T AN AUTOMATIC RIGHT TO GO IN AND VOTE.

YOU HAVE TO REGISTER TO VOTE. AND THE FINANCIAL ESTIMATING CONFERENCE REVIEWED THE NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS TO WHOM THAT MIGHT APPLY, AND IT MIGHT BE AS MANY AS 700,000 TO WHOM IT WOULD APPLY.

THEY DID AN EVALUATION OF HOW THIS PROCESS WORKS IN OTHER STATES.

MOST OTHER STATES DO ALLOW PEOPLE TO VOTE AFTER THEY'VE FULFILLED THEIR SENTENCES. AND ABOUT 20% OF THE PEOPLE WHO ARE ELIGIBLE DO THAT.

SO THEIR ESTIMATE WAS IT WOULD BE ABOUT 270,000 PEOPLE WOULD BE ELIGIBLE AND WOULD PROBABLY COME IN.

SO THE FINANCIAL ESTIMATING CONFERENCE SUGGESTS THERE WILL BE A BUMP IN EXPENSES. BUT IT WOULD ACTUALLY LEVEL OUT OVER TIME.

>> THIS INCLUDES THE COMPLETION OF THE TERMS OF PROBATION, RIGHT?

>> YES, SIR.

IT'S, IT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDES ALL MATTERS INCLUDED IN THE SENTENCE INCLUDING PROBATION AND PAROLE.

SO THAT MEANS ALL MATTERS, ANYTHING THAT A JUDGE PUTS IN A SENTENCE.

>> SO IT WOULD ALSO INCLUDE THE FULL PAYMENT OF ANY FINES?

>> YES, SIR.

YEAH, ALL TERMS MEANS ALL TERMS WITHIN THE FOUR CORNERS.

SO THE APPLICANT WOULD HAVE TO

INDICATE THAT THEY HAVE
INDICATED THAT THEY HAVE
COMPLETED ALL TERMS, AND THE
SECRETARY OF STATE WOULD VERIFY
THAT.

>> SO THE SECRETARY OF STATE
WOULD VERIFY THAT.

SO ONCE A PERSON PAYS ALL THEIR
FINES, COMPLETES THEIR PAROLE,
COMPLETES THEIR PROBATION, THAT
INFORMATION IS SENT TO THE
SECRETARY OF STATE?

>> THE SECRETARY OF STATE
ACTUALLY GATHERS IT.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE TALKS TO
FDLE, CORRECTIONS, ETC.

SO THEY COLLECT THE INFORMATION,
AND THEN THEY VERIFY IT BACK TO
THE SUPERVISOR OF ELECTIONS, AND
THE SUPERVISOR OF ELECTIONS
MAKES THAT JUDGMENT.

ULTIMATELY, IF THE APPLICANT
DOES NOT AGREE WITH THE
SUPERVISOR OF ELECTIONS, THEY
CAN GO TO THE CIRCUIT COURT.

>> SO THAT'S THE PROCESS THEY
COULD DO RIGHT NOW?

>> THAT PROCESS EXISTS BECAUSE
RIGHT NOW YOU WILL BE CHECKING
THE BOX TO SAY I AM NOT A FELON.

SO IF IT'S SENT IN AND THE
SECRETARY OF STATE IN
VERIFICATION SHOWS THAT YOU ARE,
THEN YOU ARE NOT QUALIFIED.
THEY WOULD NOT QUALIFY YOU.

>> SO EVERYONE WHO REGISTERS TO
VOTE, THE SECRETARY OF STATE
SAYS WHETHER YOU ARE OR NOT?

>> YES.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE VERIFIES
THE VOTING ROLLS.

>> OH.

>> SO THAT DOESN'T CHANGE.

AND IT'S, THAT'S WHY THE VOTING
ROLLS ARE CONSISTENT AND THEY'RE
VERIFIED.

BUT CURRENTLY IF YOU DO HAVE A
FELONY CONVICTION, THEN YOU
ENTER THE PROCESS FOR, YOU ENTER
THE PROCESS TO GO TO THE

GOVERNOR AND CABINET FOR CLEMENCY.

AND THAT PROCESS WOULD STILL BE REQUIRED FOR THE EXCEPTIONS HERE WHICH WOULD BE MURDER OR SEXUAL FELONY OFFENSE.

>> SO, BUT NOW THE PORTION THAT, ABOUT PEOPLE WHO ARE CONVICTED OF SEXUAL BATTERY AND MURDER, THEY, THIS SAYS THAT THEY WOULD NOT BE QUALIFIED UNTIL THE RESTORATION OF THEIR RIGHTS. SO THEY WOULD STILL HAVE TO GO THROUGH THE PROCESS OF--

>> THAT'S CORRECT.

THEY STILL GO THROUGH THE SAME CLEMENCY PROCESS.

SO THEY WOULD APPLY TO THE CLEMENCY BOARD FOR REVIEW AND FOR ULTIMATE, ULTIMATE APPROVAL AND REVIEW.

SO ACTUALLY BOTH THOSE, THE PARALLEL PROCESSES AS THEY EXIST WOULD CONTINUE.

BUT THE SIGNIFICANT CHANGE IS THAT SOMEONE WHO'S FULFILLED THEIR SENTENCE--

>> NOBODY HAS SAID THAT ANYTHING ABOUT WHAT'S WRITTEN HERE ON THE OTHER SIDE IS AMBIGUOUS.

AND AS YOU SAID, MOST STATES HAVE THE RESTORATION OF VOTING RIGHTS.

I MEAN, IN FACT, SOME STATES THEY NEVER LOSE IT EVEN WHEN THEY'RE IN JAIL.

SO THIS IS REALLY NOTHING DIFFERENT THAN MOST OTHER STATES HAVE.

>> THAT'S CORRECT.

MOST OTHER STATES DO.

FLORIDA IS IN A SMALL MINORITY WHERE IT'S BASICALLY ALL FELONS MUST GO THROUGH THE CLEMENCY PROCESS.

>> IS THERE A TIME LIMIT IN WHICH THE SECRETARY OF STATE HAS TO MAKE THIS INVESTIGATION TO SEE WHETHER A PERSON'S QUALIFIED TO VOTE?

OR CAN IT JUST TAKE AS LONG AS
THEY WANT?

>> I'M NOT AWARE OF A TIME
LIMIT.

>> AH.

>> SO I'M ALSO NOT AWARE THAT
THERE'S BEEN A PARTICULAR
PROBLEM.

THERE ARE CERTAINLY DISPUTES
ABOUT WHO IS REMOVED AND ON WHAT
BASIS, BUT-- AND IN THIS CASE
YOU CAN SEE WHERE THE SECRETARY
OF STATE WILL HAVE SOME
IMPORTANT WORK TO DO.

>> IF THERE'S A DISPUTE AS TO
WHETHER A PERSON IS QUALIFIED TO
REGAIN HIS RIGHT TO VOTE OR NOT,
WHERE WOULD I GO?

>> THAT PERSON GOES TO THE
CIRCUIT COURT.

SO IF YOU ARE TURNED DOWN BY THE
SUPERVISOR OF ELECTIONS, YOU GO
TO CIRCUIT COURT, AND YOU OBJECT
TO THAT CONCLUSION.

BUT YOU ULTIMATELY AS AN
APPLICANT TO VOTE, YOU GET THE,
YOU ARE TURNED DOWN OR ACCEPTED
BY THE SUPERVISOR OF ELECTIONS.

>> I JUST WONDER, WHAT KIND OF
ACTION WOULD THE PERSON HAVE TO
FILE IN CIRCUIT COURT?

IS THAT A DECK ACTION OR--

>> I THINK IT'S DESCRIBED AS AN
APPEAL.

YOU'RE APPEALING THE DECISION.
SO THAT PROBABLY PUTS YOU IN A
DIFFICULT--

>> YEAH.

>>-- POSITION BECAUSE THE
SUPERVISOR IS SIMPLY REFLECTING
WHAT THE SECRETARY OF STATE HAS
TOLD THEM.

AND IF IT'S FACTUALLY, IF YOU
DON'T QUALIFY, IT WOULD APPEAR
THAT YOU DON'T QUALIFY--

>> I WOULD SUSPECT WITH THE
DEPENDING IF IT PASSES OR NOT,
THAT THOSE WHO ARE FELONS WHO
HAVE SERVED THEIR SENTENCE, THAT
THERE ARE OTHER DOCUMENTS, YOU

KNOW, CERTIFIED COPY OF WHATEVER OCCURS AT THE END OF FULFILLING YOUR PROBATION WITH OR THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS HAS THIS INFORMATION.

SO THOSE-- I MEAN, WE'RE TALKING ABOUT THINGS THAT REALLY THE DETAILS ARE NOT PART OF WHAT ANYONE'S SAYING ARE CONFUSING OR THAT THIS IS GOING TO BE A FINANCIAL BURDEN.

SO WE'RE ASKING YOU, I GUESS, SOME QUESTIONS THAT MAYBE STILL HAVE TO BE IRONED OUT, WHICH IS NOT UNUSUAL WITH THESE BALLOT INITIATIVES.

>> RIGHT.

THE INITIATIVES, AS LONG AS THEY PROVIDE A FAIR QUESTION AND THEY NOTIFY THE VOTER AS TO THE PRINCIPAL QUESTION, THEY FULFILL THE MISSION.

AND IN TERMS OF THE FINANCIAL IMPACT STATEMENT, THAT'S FURTHER TO INFORM THE VOTER IF THERE IS A SUBSTANTIAL IMPACT AND WHAT THE IMPACT IS.

IT IS INTERESTING THE FINANCIAL IMPACT STATEMENT SAID, IN FACT, IT MAY REDUCE FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS OF THE CLEMENCY BOARD, ULTIMATELY BECAUSE THERE'D BE FEWER PEOPLE GOING THROUGH CLEMENCY.

>> ALSO, I GUESS, IF THEY HAVE TO-- I GUESS THEY'LL STILL-- WILL THEY STILL HAVE TO CHECK EVERY PERSON REGISTERING TO SEE IF THEY ARE A FELON?

OR HOW--

>> YES.

>> THAT WILL STILL HAPPEN.

>> I MEAN, THAT DOESN'T CHANGE. SO THE FORM, ACTUALLY THE CURRENT FORM IS REALLY QUITE SIMPLE.

IT'S ONE PAGE.

AND IT WOULD BE CHANGED BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE WOULD BE UNIFORM.

>> THE FORM YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT IS A FORM THAT ANYONE WOULD FILL OUT--

>> ANYONE FILLS OUT.

>>-- IN ORDER TO VOTE.

>> CORRECT.

SO YOU WOULD, YOU GO IN AND FILL OUT A FORM TO REGISTER TO VOTE, AND IT NOW ASKS YOU IF YOU ARE A FELON.

SO IF YOU CHECK YES, YOU WILL NOT BE QUALIFIED TO VOTE.

SO NOW--

>> BUT THERE'S NO FOLLOW-UP QUESTION THAT SAYS AND IF YOU ANSWER YES, HAVE YOUR RIGHTS BEEN RESTORED?

[LAUGHTER]

>> WELL, THERE ISN'T THAT QUESTION YET.

SO NOW THE QUESTION WOULD HAVE TO BE HAVE YOU FULFILLED ALL TERMS OF YOUR SENTENCE INCLUDING PROBATION, PAROLE AND ALL TERMS THAT ARE PART OF YOUR SENTENCE. AND IF YOU CHECK THAT, YOU NEED TO BE CORRECT BECAUSE CURRENTLY IF YOU CHECK, YOU DON'T CHECK THAT YOU ARE A FELON OR YOU ARE, THAT ITSELF IS A FELONY.

>> I THINK, I MEAN, THE QUESTION WILL HAVE TO BE HAS THE SECRETARY OF STATE CERTIFIED--

>> YES.

>>-- THAT YOU HAVE-- INSTEAD OF GOING HAVE YOU, ALL THOSE THINGS.

BECAUSE THEN WHO'S GOING TO MAKE THAT DECISION BELOW AT THE VOTER REGISTRATION OFFICE.

SO IT WOULD HAVE TO BE THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

AND IF YOU CHECK YES TO THAT, THEN I GUESS IT'S A PROBATIONARY BALLOT SO THEY CAN DOUBLE CHECK?

>> WELL, YOU DON'T, YOU'RE NOT YET REGISTERED UNTIL YOU'RE CERTIFIED.

>> THIS IS TO REGISTER TO VOTE, OKAY.

>> I HAVE A QUESTION.
YOU SAID THAT TERMS OF SENTENCE
INCLUDE FINES AND COSTS.
AND IT'S THE, THAT'S THE WAY
IT'S GENERALLY PRONOUNCED IN
CRIMINAL COURT.
WOULD IT ALSO INCLUDE
RESTITUTION WHEN IT WAS ORDERED
TO A VICTIM AS PART OF THE
SENTENCE?
>> YES.
>> IN PREPARING THE FINANCIAL
IMPACT STATEMENT, DID ANYONE--
I ASSUME THAT THE SECRETARY OF
STATE CAN CONTACT THE DEPARTMENT
OF CORRECTIONS TO DETERMINE
WHETHER SOMEONE-- OR DO A
CRIMINAL HISTORY TO SEE IF
SOMEONE'S A FELON.
BUT WITH RESPECT TO COST, THAT
INFORMATION MIGHT NEED TO COME
FROM 67 DIFFERENT LOCAL
CLERKS--
>> CLERKS OF COURT.
>> WAS THAT CONSIDERED IN
DETERMINING THE FINANCIAL
IMPACT?
>> THEY DID.
AND THEY, THEY ACTUALLY ASSESS
COST THAT WAS X NUMBER OF
DOLLARS THAT IT TAKES THEM TO
CHECK.
SO THEY DID ASSESS THAT.
AND THEN THEY DID EXPECT THAT
THIS WOULD BE, THERE WOULD BE A
BUMP IN COSTS.
>> AND THEN DO WE KNOW WHETHER
ALL THE CLERKS KEEP TRACK OF
RESTITUTION IN CRIMINAL CASES
WHEN THERE'S NOT PROBATION
IMPOSED?
>> WELL, IF IT IS WITHIN THE
FOUR CORNERS OF THE SENTENCE, IT
SHOULD BE IN THE RECORD.
THAT'S MY UNDERSTANDING.
>> THE FACT THAT IT'S IMPOSED
WOULD BE IN THE RECORD.
>> RIGHT.
>> I'M WONDERING WHETHER THE
CLERK WOULD EVEN KNOW WHETHER IT

HAD BEEN PAID IN ALL CASES.

>> WELL, THAT'S--

>> DID THEY, DID THEY CHECK THAT?

>>-- A REASONABLE QUESTION.

>> THAT BRINGS UP, JUST SINCE WE'RE ASKING THESE QUESTIONS THAT YOU'RE HOPING WILL BE DETAILS IF THIS PASSES, BUT IT WOULD SEEM THAT COULD THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE OR THE SECRETARY OF STATE REQUIRE MORE OF THE REGISTRANT WHO HAS BEEN CONVICTED OF A FELONY TO ACTUALLY THEMSELVES CERTIFY I'VE DONE THIS, I'VE DONE THIS AND WITH CERTIFIED COPIES, NUMBER ONE.

AND NUMBER TWO, I'M THINKING MAYBE THIS WOULD ACTUALLY HELP THE STATE BECAUSE IF FINES, COSTS AND RESTITUTION ARE A REQUIREMENT, THERE'S-- FOR THOSE THAT WANT TO VOTE, THERE'S A BIG MOTIVATION TO PAY UNPAID COSTS, FINES AND RESTITUTION. SO TWO THINGS.

ONE, COULD-- WITHOUT BURDENING THE VOTER, IF THERE'S AN ANSWER HAVE YOU EVER BEEN CONVICTED OF A FELONY, YES, AND THEN I THINK AS JUSTICE QUINCE WAS SAYING, WELL, HAVE YOUR VOTING RIGHTS BEEN RESTORED WHICH CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER THE CURRENT STATUTE.

BUT IF THE NEXT QUESTION IS AND HAVE YOU COMPLETED ALL REQUIREMENTS, GIVE US THE DATE AND WHATEVER SO THAT THERE'S SOME OBLIGATION ON THE VOTER.

>> I--

>> OR THE POTENTIAL--

>> THERE'S NO REASON THAT THE SECRETARY OF STATE COULDN'T DO THAT.

>> SO THAT'S IN THE DETAILS.

>> BECAUSE THE SCOPE OF THIS CLEARLY SAYS THAT'S WHAT'S REQUIRED.

SO IF THEY THINK THAT

PROCESS WOULD BE THE BEST WAY TO DETERMINE THAT RESULT, THEN THEY COULD.

>> WHO ACTUALLY PROMULGATES THAT FORM?

IS THAT THE SECRETARY OF STATE'S FORM OR THE SUPERVISOR?

>> IT IS THE SECRETARY OF STATE'S FORM.

>> OKAY.

>> SO, YES, EVERY SUPERVISOR OF ELECTIONS HAS THAT FORM FOR THEM TO FILL OUT.

>> IT WOULD SEEM LIKE THE SECRETARY OF STATE ONCE HE OR SHE CONDUCTS THE BACKGROUND INVESTIGATION AND CONFIRMS THAT THE PERSON HAS DONE EVERYTHING HE WAS SUPPOSED TO DO WOULD ISSUE SOME TYPE OF CERTIFICATE, OFFICIAL CERTIFICATE THAT THE VOTER, POTENTIAL VOTER COULD TAKE TO THE REGISTRATION OFFICE AND SHOW THEM THE CERTIFICATES, AND THAT WOULD TAKE CARE OF IT INSTEAD OF JUST HAVING THE REGISTRATION PERSON GO BACK AND CHECK WITH THE SECRETARY OF STATE AND THAT'S JUST MORE DELAY, MORE BUREAUCRACY.

>> SO THAT YOU'RE SAYING THE INDIVIDUAL WOULD HAVE A PATH TO THEMSELVES--

>> RIGHT.

>>-- DEMONSTRATE THAT THEY HAVE COMPLETED ALL TERMS.

>> RIGHT.

AN OFFICIAL CERTIFICATE FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE, SHOW THEM AT THE CLERK WHEN YOU GO TO REGISTER, HERE IT IS.

EVERYBODY RECOGNIZES IT, AND IT'S DONE.

INSTEAD OF, AGAIN, HAVING TO CALL BACK OR CHECK BACK WITH THE SECRETARY OF STATE, AND THAT WOULD--

>> TO ESTABLISH A POLICY PROACTIVELY.

>> RIGHT.

>> YEAH.
WHICH MAKES COMPLETE SENSE.
SO OVERALL, YOUR HONOR, THIS--
THE PURPOSE IS CLEARLY
ARTICULATED.
IT IS A RESTORATION OF VOTING
RIGHTS UNDER THESE SPECIFIC
CONDITIONS.
IT'S CLEAR TO THE VOTER IN TERMS
OF MEETING THE SINGLE SUBJECT
TEST AND THE BALLOT TITLE AND
SUMMARY ARE CLEAR.
>> [INAUDIBLE]
>> THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
>> THANK YOU FOR YOUR ARGUMENT.
>> YES, YOUR HONOR.
>> [INAUDIBLE]
WOULD YOU LIKE TO INTRODUCE
YOURSELF TO THE COURT--
[INAUDIBLE]
>> YOUR HONOR, THANK YOU SO
MUCH.
IT'S SUCH A GREAT HONOR TO BE
APPEARING IN FRONT OF THIS COURT
FOR MY FIRST TIME.
I WAS APPOINTED SOLICITOR
GENERAL LAST YEAR, AND--
>> WE'RE LOOKING FORWARD TO
HEARING YOU.
>> THANK YOU SO MUCH.
PLEASURE TO MEET ALL OF YOU.
>> THANK YOU.