

Submitter: Matthew Ford
On Behalf Of:
Committee: Senate Committee On Rules
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB210

The proposed bill would only continue the attempt to disenfranchise the poor as they would likely be too busy - working - to be able to stand in extremely long lines on election day, and be unable to take time off to do so. While it is "legally required" to give your employees time off to vote, that really only applies to salaried employees, as no part-time employer pays their employees their wage to go wait in line to vote. Beyond that fact, while it is not legal, managers often hold it against their employees when they ask for time off for things like this, often getting upset because it could lead to them having to shut the business down for part of the day.

Even ignoring those working part time, as a registered nurse who regularly works 13-16 hour days in a hospital, it would be impossible for every nurse to vote on election day. Hospitals can't shut down for a day, and they don't have enough budget or staff to overstaff enough for a day to let everyone vote. Considering wait times in the states I have lived in previously (Michigan and Indiana) were often 2-3 hours to vote, that would necessitate a local critical care unit to staff 9 nurses instead of 6 to cover for that time if it took 2.5 hours in line for every nurse and there was a bit of travel time. That's still ignoring that the night shift nurses would also have to shift their sleep schedules and stand in line for time either before their evening shift that night or after their shift the night before, and most voting spots only open at 9 am, which is two hours after most nurse shifts end. In and of itself this would lead to possible dangerous situations in hospitals as staff would be underrested, overworked, and there would be a lot more changing of care of the patients than there should be, which often leads to missed changes in patient condition.

For these reasons - and there's many other reasons as well - it's clear to me that requiring in-person voting on the day of the election's goal is not to provide election security - as election fraud is statistically extremely low as-is - but is to disenfranchise as many voters that will likely vote liberal as possible, especially those minorities and lower income people who cannot afford to take that much time off to vote, or may have other more pressing issues, such as childcare. It's a simple continuance of the conservative push to continue to design voting districts and limit access to voting as much as possible for minorities and poor people in an attempt to gain and keep power.

Ultimately isn't the goal of voting supposed to be hearing the voice of the people? If that's the goal - which it is per the constitution - then Oregon's current mail-in ballot system works very well, and is very secure with an extremely low fraud rate.