

**Testimony Concerning Senate Bill 89
Election Law – Incarcerated Individuals – Voter Hotline and Voting Eligibility
(Voting Rights for All Act)
Position: Favorable**

To: Senator Brian J. Feldman, Chair
Senator Cheryl C. Kagan, Vice-Chair
Members of the Education, Energy, and the Environment Committee

From: Michael Pinard, Faculty Director; and Monique L. Dixon, Executive Director,
Gibson-Banks Center for Race and the Law, University of Maryland Francis King
Carey School of Law

Date: February 9, 2026

On behalf of the Gibson-Banks Center for Race and the Law (“Gibson-Banks Center”) at the University of Maryland Francis King Carey School of Law,¹ we appreciate the opportunity to submit testimony in support of Senate Bill 89 (“SB 89”), which would, among other things, allow individuals incarcerated in Maryland’s prisons the opportunity to vote in state and federal elections. We urge the committee to issue a favorable report because: (1) the right to vote is fundamental to civic inclusion and engagement in our democracy; (2) denying voting rights to Marylanders who are incarcerated binds to a long history of Black disenfranchisement in the United States and disproportionately impacts Black Marylanders today, given the extreme overrepresentation of Black people in Maryland’s prison; and (3) extending the franchise in the ways set forth in SB 89 recognizes and cherishes the shared humanity of Marylanders, whether or not incarcerated.

The Gibson-Banks Center works collaboratively to re-imagine and transform institutions and systems of racial inequality, marginalization, and oppression. Through education and engagement, advocacy, and research, the Center examines and addresses racial inequality,

¹ This written testimony is submitted on behalf of the Gibson-Banks Center and not on behalf of the University of Maryland Francis King Carey School of Law, the University of Maryland, Baltimore, or the University System of Maryland.

including the intersection of race with sex or disability, and advances racial justice in a variety of issue areas, including the criminal legal system and voting rights.

The right to vote is fundamental. This year commemorates the 140th anniversary of the seminal United States Supreme Court case, *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*.² In *Yick Wo*, the Court articulated that voting is “a fundamental political right, because preservative of all rights.”³ In short, our voting rights protect and preserve our other rights. Thus, voting is the highest form of civic engagement. As such, depriving individuals of the ability to vote is a form of civic banishment.

Throughout U.S. history, Black people have been excluded from the franchise through various means.⁴ Disenfranchisement laws, from their beginning, were anchored in race. During Reconstruction, disenfranchisement was designed to circumvent and subvert the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution, which extended birthright citizenship to Black formerly enslaved persons, among other things, and prohibited racial discrimination in voting, respectively. Disenfranchisement also further cemented white supremacy.⁵ These efforts continued during the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, with numerous (and adaptive) tactics deployed to prevent free Blacks from voting, including poll taxes and literacy tests.⁶

Disenfranchisement based on felony convictions has long been among the tools deployed to exclude Black citizens from voting booths. With post-Civil War roots, this form of disenfranchisement originally paired with “a slew of criminal laws designed to target [B]lack citizens,”⁷ as “many states enacted broad disenfranchisement laws that revoked voting rights

² *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356 (1886). While *Yick Wo* was not a voting rights case, the Court’s recognition of voting as a fundamental right has been repeated in subsequent voting rights cases. See, e.g., *Harper, et al. v. Virginia Board of Elections, et al*, 383 U.S. 663, 667 (1966) (citing to *Yick Wo* and other cases to support the notion that voting is a fundamental right.)

³ *Id.* at 370.

⁴ E.g., Anthony C. Thompson, *Unlocking Democracy: Examining the Collateral Consequences of Mass Incarceration on Black Political Power*, 54 HOWARD L. J. 587, 591 (2011) (“Political disenfranchisement of African-American communities has deep roots in the history of the United States.”).

⁵ E.g., Juan F. Perea, *Echoes of Slavery II: How Slavery’s Legacy Distorts Democracy*, 51 U.C. DAVIS L. REV. 1081, 1097 (2018) (“Since the Fifteenth Amendment prohibited direct race discrimination in voting, southern whites acted by proxy, shaping criminal law in such a way that disenfranchised newly freed [B]lacks.”).

⁶ E.g., Michael J. Klarman, *The Plessy Era*, 1998 SUP. CT. REV. 303, 309 (1998) (“Beginning around 1890, southern states adopted legal measures as poll taxes and literacy tests to supplement the substantial de facto disenfranchisement of [B]lacks already accomplished through violence and fraud.”); Malia Brink, 45 HUM. RTS. 12, 12 (2020) (“In the Jim Crow era, states enacted a number of laws to impede [B]lack people from voting, including residency and property restrictions, literacy tests, and poll taxes.”).

⁷ ERIN KELLY, BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE, RACISM AND FELONY DISENFRANCHISEMENT: AN INTERTWINED HISTORY I (May 9, 2017), <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/racism-felony-disenfranchisement-intertwined-history>. See Thompson, *supra* note 3, at 592 (disenfranchisement based on felony convictions “has had a direct impact on [B]lack voter participation in the political process since the period immediately following the Civil War when state laws were in enacted to in order to disenfranchise [B]lacks”).

from anyone convicted of any felony.”⁸ Today, disenfranchisement laws based on felony convictions continue to particularly impact Black people.⁹ According to the Sentencing Project, “[o]ne in 22 African Americans of voting age is disenfranchised, a rate more than triple that of non-African Americans.”¹⁰

While sobering, this context is necessary to grasp the urgency of SB 89, as it aims to remove the last vestige of disenfranchisement in Maryland based on criminal convictions. Until 2007, Maryland was among the few remaining states that imposed lifetime disenfranchisement on individuals based on their criminal records. Legislative advances over the past 19 years have led to Marylanders regaining their voting rights upon their release from incarceration.¹¹

Now is the time to remove Maryland’s remaining vestige of disenfranchisement by enacting SB 89 and extending voting rights to Marylanders housed in Maryland’s prisons. Today, Maryland has the ignominious distinction of incarcerating the highest percentage of Black people in the United States. Over 71% of Maryland’s incarcerated population is Black, which more than doubles the State’s overall Black population.¹² Thus, carceral disenfranchisement and race are tightly intertwined in Maryland, as “[v]oting eligible Black Marylanders are nearly six times as likely as white Marylanders to lose their right to vote due to incarceration for a felony conviction.”¹³

Maryland should join Maine, Vermont, Washington, D.C., and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the U.S. jurisdictions that allow individuals who are incarcerated to vote. The District of Columbia extended the franchise to these now eligible voters in 2020.¹⁴ As the D.C.

⁸ KELLY, *supra* note 7, at 1.

⁹ E.g., Gabriel J. Chin, *Reconstruction, Felon Disenfranchisement, and the Right to Vote: Did the Fifteenth Amendment Repeal Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment*, 92 GEO. L.J. 259, 261-262 (2004) (“Criminal disenfranchisement . . . remains the major basis for the disproportionate disenfranchisement of African-American adults.”).

¹⁰ CHRISTOPHER UGGEN ET AL., THE SENTENCING PROJECT, LOCKED OUT 2024: FOUR MILLION DENIED VOTING RIGHTS DUE TO A FELONY CONVICTION 2 (2024), <https://www.sentencingproject.org/app/uploads/2024/10/Locked-Out-2024-Four-Million-Denied-Voting-Rights-Due-to-a-Felony-Conviction.pdf>.

¹¹ See BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE, VOTING RIGHTS RESTORATION EFFORTS IN MARYLAND: A SUMMARY OF CURRENT FELONY DISENFRANCHISEMENT POLICIES AND LEGISLATIVE ADVOCACY IN MARYLAND (2020) (summarizing these legislative advances), <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/voting-rights-restoration-efforts-maryland>.

¹² See MARYLAND DEP’T. PUB. SAFETY AND CORR. SVCS, DOC DATA DASHBOARD, FY 2024 SENTENCED POPULATION OVERVIEW, DOC INMATE DEMOGRAPHICS (Black people comprised 71.2% of the incarcerated population in FY 2024 and the “[d]emographic trends among sentence inmates are largely consistent from year to year”), https://www.dpscs.state.md.us/community_releases/DOC-Annual-Data-Dashboard.shtml.

¹³ RACHEL DIDER-JOLIE & KRISTEN M. BUDD, PH.D., THE SENTENCING PROJECT, WHY WE MUST RESTORE VOTING RIGHTS TO OVER 16,000 MARYLANDERS 1 (Jan. 31, 2025), <https://www.sentencingproject.org/app/uploads/2025/02/Why-We-Must-Restore-Voting-Rights-to-Over-16000-Marylanders.pdf>. Also, “[t]he disenfranchisement rate of Maryland’s voting eligible Latino population is twice that of the white voting eligible population. *Id.*

¹⁴ D.C. CODE § 1-1001.07(c)(1)(B)(ii) (“[The Department of Corrections] shall automatically register each qualified elector in its care or custody in the Central Detention Facility or Correctional Treatment Facility to vote.”).

Council recognized when passing this law, “[v]oting is a way to maintain [community] connections and to feel stronger ties to one’s community while incarcerated.”¹⁵

Countries throughout the world are similarly instructive. According to the Sentencing Project, Human Rights Watch, and the ACLU, 35 countries do not deny voting rights under any circumstances based on criminal convictions. These countries include Canada, Denmark, Ghana, Iran, Israel, Lithuania, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, and Namibia.¹⁶ In this context, a 2002 decision from the Supreme Court of Canada offers important lessons, as it speaks to the humanity of extending the franchise to incarcerated individuals as well as the perpetuation of racial harms of not doing so. In *Sauvé v. Canada (Chief Electoral Officer)*, the Court overturned a law that denied the right to vote to individuals who were sentenced to prison for more than two years.¹⁷ Rejecting the argument that “only those who respect the law should participate in the political process,” the Court declared that disenfranchising incarcerated individuals “on the basis of moral unworthiness is inconsistent with the respect for the dignity of every person that lies at the heart of Canadian democracy. . . .”¹⁸ The Court also lamented that carceral disenfranchisement “removes a route to social development and undermines correctional law and policy directed towards rehabilitation and integration.”¹⁹ In addition, the Court observed that the law had “a disproportionate impact on Canada’s already disadvantaged Aboriginal population[,]” given their disproportionate incarceration.²⁰

Voting in prison is *more* than extending the franchise to individuals who are incarcerated. Those of us who cherish our ability to vote understand deeply that the franchise is much more than circling the box for our chosen candidate. We value civic inclusion and speaking directly in furtherance of our democracy. Voting is both an act and a feeling. Through voting, Marylanders who are incarcerated would understand that their voices matter and that they are valued members of our shared community who deserve a voice in the affairs of the polity.

For these reasons set forth above, we ask for a favorable report on SB 89.

¹⁵ Council of the District of Columbia, Committee on the Judiciary & Public Safety, Committee Report on B23-0324 (the “Restore the Vote Amendment Act of 2020”), 7 (Sept. 24, 2020) (citing hearing witness testimony), https://lms.dccouncil.gov/downloads/LIMS/42718/Committee_Report/B23-0324-Committee_Report1.pdf?Id=111813.

¹⁶ THE SENTENCING PROJECT, HUMAN RIGHTS WATCH, AND ACLU, OUT OF STEP: U.S. POLICY ON VOTING RIGHTS IN GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE Tbl. 2, 21-28 (2024), <https://www.sentencingproject.org/app/uploads/2024/08/Out-of-Step-U.S.-Policy-on-Voting-Rights-in-Global-Perspective.pdf>. Also, 21 other countries only deny voting rights to individuals incarcerated for specific crimes, such as treason and elections-related offenses. *Id.*

¹⁷ *Sauvé v. Canada (Chief Electoral Officer)* [2002] 3 S.C.R. 519 (Can).

¹⁸ *Id.* at 522.

¹⁹ *Id.* at 523.

²⁰ *Id.*