



Written Statement: House Hearing, Nov. 2, 2021

<p>Presenters: Alex Weddon and James Johnson</p> <p>Pure Integrity for Michigan Elections</p> <p>https://pureintegritymichiganelections.org, purintegrityforme@gmail.com</p> <p>In support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eaton County Republican Women’s Alliance • MC4EI, Michigan Citizens for Election Integrity, based in Oakland County 	<p>Before the Michigan House Standing Committee on Elections and Ethics,</p> <p>Representative Ann Bollin, Chair</p> <p>Tuesday, Nov. 2, 2021, 12:00 p.m., Room 326, House Office Building, Lansing, MI</p> <p>Committee Clerk, Amy Rostkowycz, (517) 373-1260, arostkowycz@house.mi.gov</p>
--	---

Pure Integrity for Michigan Elections is a grassroots group composed of about 500 supporters, located primarily in Ingham, Eaton, and Jackson counties, and across the state. In order to achieve its mission, to help restore election integrity to Michigan Elections, PIME analyzes current election bills and laws with an eye toward closing gaps and opportunities for abuse by those who would undermine free and fair elections. We appreciate our legislators’ hard work and seek to work alongside them to achieve maximum transparency, checks and balances, ethics, and integrity in election law. PIME is a peaceful, issue-based, nonpartisan political movement that welcomes all who support election integrity and the US and Michigan Constitutions.

Agenda:

HB 5474 (Rep. Meerman)	Elections; election officials; posting of unofficial precinct election results on a website by a county, city, or township clerk; clarify.
HB 4923 (Rep. Steven Johnson)	Elections; voters; definition of identification for election purposes; expand to include current concealed pistol license.
HB 5273 (Rep. Hertel)	Counties; charter; nonpartisan election of county executives; allow under certain circumstances.

1. **HB 5474 (Rep. Meerman, R) Elections; election officials; posting of unofficial precinct election results on a website by a county, city, or township clerk; clarify.**

PIME Position: Support with amendments. Recommend adding language in **yellowed** and bracketed American typewriter font. Unofficial results should not be made public or

released to individuals or organizations until official results are finalized. All parties with access to unofficial election tallies should be prohibited from sharing that information. Leaking early election returns only serves to create problems with election security. Sharing premature results encourages fraudsters to manufacture and deliver ballots and thereby alter honest and authentic election results.

To argue that it has not been proven that fraud occurs if premature results are released is like saying if a patient does not incur sepsis from non-sterile technique, then we don't need to put preventive measures in place and adhere to them. We wouldn't tolerate that looseness in medicine, and we shouldn't tolerate it in election-related matters.

Violators should be subject to punishment to the fullest extent of the law.

Recommendation:

(2) A city or township clerk shall not post on any website [, share with an unauthorized person or entity, or make public in any way] the unofficial results of a precinct in that city or township until all of the precinct ballot returns and absent voter ballot returns for that precinct are complete.

(3) A county clerk shall not post on any website [, share with unauthorized person or entity, or make public in any way] the unofficial results of a city or township precinct located in that county until all of the precinct ballot returns and absent voter ballot returns for that city or township precinct are complete.

[Any person who leaks unofficial election results shall be punishable by felony and 10 years in prison.]

2. HB 4923 (Rep. Steven Johnson, R) Elections; voters; expand definition of identification for election purposes to include current concealed pistol license.

PIME Position: Oppose. If the intent of this legislation was to make elections more secure, the suggested changes appear to render them less secure because a concealed pistol license (CPL) holder need not be a U.S. citizen.

CPLs are issued to citizens and noncitizens alike with no indication on the license as to citizenship status. The *Michigan State Police Concealed Pistol Guide and Application*, Publication RI-012, states, “An applicant for a Michigan CPL must 2. Be a citizen of the United States or an alien lawfully admitted into the United States.” (See two pages attached.)

CPL, while they may provide proof of identity, they do NOT provide any of the verification necessary to register to vote. Given our state’s same-day registration, the use of the CPL for

identification purposes risks enabling non-citizens to vote. We don't need to add a non-citizen verified CPL to all the other documents allowed for proof of ID.

This discussion raises another important question: With all the various methods of showing ones ID, , other than showing a notarized birth certificate, which of these methods verifies whether a registrant is a citizen or not?

Lacking a notarized birth certificate, how is the citizenship of a voter registrant verified while applying for a driver’s license? Verification of US citizenship is required under Michigan law. However, according to the Secretary of State’s website, to apply for a driver’s license, “You'll need to present documentation of a valid Social Security number or letter of ineligibility, U.S. citizenship or legal presence if not a U.S. citizen, identity and Michigan residency.”

It is insufficient for people to simply sign to “attest” to citizenship. That is not verification.

3. HB 5273 (Rep. Hertel, D) Counties; charter; nonpartisan election of county executives; allow under certain circumstances

PIME Position: Oppose. The proposed amendments appear to represent an attempt to camouflage radical agendas and ideologies in order to gain power for the county executive and then amend and revise county charters at the initiation of the newly elected county executive.

This bill invites candidate deception and ambiguity. Certainly, citizens want judges to operate in a nonpartisan manner, but county government is political. Voters deserve to know as much as possible about the belief systems, party affiliations, and political ideologies of the candidates they are choosing.

The push to allow nonpartisan county executive candidates on the ballot appears to be an attempt to mislead and deceive the voting public. If enacted, this bill would help candidates conceal what they truly stand for or oppose. We need more honesty and transparency in election campaigns, not less.

Respectfully submitted,

Patrice Johnson, Chair, Pure Integrity for Michigan Elections	Katherine Schmidt and Libby Ranshaw, Eaton County Republican Women’s Alliance	Rebecca Behrends, MD VP Research, Secretary Michigan Citizens for Election Integrity
---	---	---



