



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 172

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2026

No. 29

House of Representatives

The House met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. EVANS of Colorado).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 11, 2026.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GABE EVANS, to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Set Your law before us, O God, that the laws made here and the men and women who determine them may find alignment with Your will and obedience to Your precepts. And what does Your law require, but to love You with our whole heart, soul, and mind.

Before we do anything today, may we order our hearts—our emotions, our desires, and our wills—to love You. May we look deep into our souls, the very essence that drives and defines us, and find there a passion to remain in fellowship with Your spirit. As we use our minds, with their capacity for understanding and knowledge, may we commit our thoughts to remain attuned to Your own.

Beyond this, while we are not obliged to be of the same will or opinion with each other, we are commanded to show one another love. In our dealings and discussions, in our composure and our compassion toward each other, may we fulfill the law that is like unto the first: to love one another as we love ourselves. On these hang the success of this day, for in seeking Your desire for us, we will discover in the joy found in obedience to Your law.

It is in Your sovereign name we pray.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House the approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MCGOVERN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 1383, VETERANS ACCESSIBILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT OF 2025; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2189, LAW-ENFORCEMENT INNOVATE TO DE-ESCALATE ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 261, UNDERSEA CABLE PROTECTION ACT OF 2025; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3617, SECURING AMERICA'S CRITICAL MINERALS SUPPLY ACT

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1057 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1057

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 1383) to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access,

and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119-19, modified by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to commit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2189) to modernize Federal firearms laws to account for advancements in technology and less-than-lethal weapons, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119-18 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 261) to amend the National Marine Sanctuaries Act to prohibit requiring an authorization for the installation, continued presence, operation, maintenance, repair, or recovery of undersea fiber optic cables in a national marine sanctuary if such activities have previously been authorized by a Federal or State agency. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2121

amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3617) to amend the Department of Energy Organization Act to secure the supply of critical energy resources, including critical minerals and other materials, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 5. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of February 13, 2026, relating to a measure continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026.

□ 1110

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Last night, the Rules Committee met and produced a rule providing for consideration of four pieces of legislation. The rule provides for consideration of S. 1383, the SAVE America Act, under a closed rule with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration or their respective designees and provides for one motion to commit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 2189, the Law-Enforce-

ment Innovate to De-Escalate Act, under a closed rule with 1 hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees and provides for one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 261, the Undersea Cable Protection Act of 2025, under a closed rule with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees and provides for one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 3617, the Securing America's Critical Mineral Supply Act, under a closed rule with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees and provides for one motion to recommit.

Further, the rule provides same-day authority through Friday, February 13, for a rule providing for consideration of a continuing resolution related to the Department of Homeland Security funding.

Mr. Speaker, as the House of Representatives works to deliver on the critical issues our Nation faces, we urge our colleagues today to prioritize the passage of S. 1383, the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act, or the SAVE America Act, which builds upon the SAVE Act introduced in previous Congresses that requires States to obtain proof of citizenship for Federal elections, ensuring only U.S. citizens are voting in those elections. In addition, the SAVE America Act requires individuals to present a valid photo identification before voting.

Our Founders set forth our electoral processes 250 years ago based upon the simple and ultimate principle that only Americans should vote. However, in this age of progressive, suicidal empathy, basic concepts such as voter ID and proof of citizenship have been attacked as suppression.

Let's consider the facts.

Fact one: Under the previous administration, the Biden-Harris-Mayorkas administration, some 10 million or more illegal aliens poured into communities across our country, adding to an existing foreign-born population, which totals upward of over 50 million people or close to 16 percent.

Fact two: While only U.S. citizens are legally eligible to vote in Federal elections, Federal law actually interferes with and prevents States from using Federal data to check their voter rolls to ensure that only citizens are voting, such that we end up in the upside-down situation where a State like Arizona has two different sets of systems, one for State and local and one for Federal.

Fact three: This is a recipe for fraud and a recipe for having people vote who

shouldn't be voting. It undermines people's confidence in our electoral system. When combined with the fact that several jurisdictions offer driver's licenses and other benefits to illegal aliens and other foreign nationals, it provides opportunity for noncitizens to register to vote.

Fact four: Polling data is overwhelmingly in support of the SAVE America Act and its principles, that only American citizens should vote, and that we should use voter identification when we go to vote. Polling indicates that over 70 percent of Democrats across this country, over 90 percent of Republicans, and well over 70 percent of virtually every ethnicity and ethnic group in the country—Black Americans, Hispanic Americans, White Americans, men, women, rural, urban—overwhelmingly support voter identification and ensuring that only citizens vote.

Fact five: We passed the SAVE Act in the previous, preceding Congress. We passed the SAVE Act in this Congress focusing on citizenship. We now bring the SAVE America Act forward that adds voter identification, which is, again, overwhelmingly popular.

The SAVE Act passed on a bipartisan basis. Democrats joined with us in the previous Congress. Democrats joined with us in this Congress. In both instances, the House of Representatives affirmed that only U.S. citizens should vote in Federal elections.

Let's add voter ID to it. Let's pass the SAVE America Act. Let's send it over to the Senate and let the Senate move this legislation to the President's desk.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have four bills in this rule today. All of them are completely closed—no amendments, no debate, completely closed. I feel like I am in Russia. Three of them are from the failed rule last night, which was the third failed rule in this Congress, the seventh under Speaker Johnson, and the tenth of the reigning Republican majority. That alone demonstrates Republicans' inability to govern.

Then we have the so-called SAVE America Act. The gentleman from Texas is going to spend today's debate trying to convince you that this is a commonsense, simple bill, but I want you to remember a very few important facts while he is talking.

First of all, it is already illegal for noncitizens to vote in Federal elections, period, full stop. If noncitizens are voting in Federal elections, they should be prosecuted. We don't disagree on that.

Second, nobody disputes the fact that voters should follow the law and indicate who they are. We agree on that, too. Nobody is debating that on the floor today.

What we are debating is whether we are going to believe the BS conspiracy theories cooked up by Donald Trump and MAGA Republicans about whether or not elections can be trusted in this country.

What we are debating is whether, in response to those lies, we are going to require Americans to go down to their county clerk, to take the train to city hall, or to drive down to the registrar's office and jump through bureaucratic hoops just to register to vote.

Who asked for more red tape? Did Jim Crow call?

I mean, that is what this bill is about. It is not about voter ID. It is about voter registration, and it is about voter suppression.

We always tell people to vote, make their voices heard, participate in our democracy, right? Those are supposed to be good things.

Why are Republicans passing a bill that makes it as hard as possible to vote? I will let them answer that question, but I guess it is about what I have come to expect from a party that no longer believes in democracy, though.

Yesterday, in the Rules Committee, I asked the chairman of the Committee on House Administration a simple question: Did Donald Trump win or lose the State of Minnesota in the last three Presidential elections? It is not a curve ball; not a difficult question.

Of course, anyone living in reality knows the answer to this—Donald Trump lost Minnesota three times—but not Donald Trump. He continues denying election results. He said just last Friday that because of voter fraud, he feels he won Minnesota.

The Republican chairman of the House Administration Committee, the congressional committee which regulates Federal election laws, couldn't give me a straight answer, couldn't answer that question. He couldn't tell me if he agreed with Donald Trump. He wouldn't say who won Minnesota. He went through all kinds of contortions to avoid answering the question.

I mean, this is a simple question. That is shocking, Mr. Speaker. I mean, you guys want America to trust you to write our election laws? Americans can't even trust you to tell us who won the election.

Oh, and then here is another thing: One of the changes that were made—by the way, this bill didn't go through committee process. I mean, this was kind of rushed to the floor. All kinds of major changes have been made in the last week, but here is one of the major changes: This bill, if passed, was supposed to take effect in the year 2027. There is a change in this bill. It takes place immediately, for this election.

I mean, how is that going to happen? We have elections beginning in a matter of a few weeks, and you are expecting every State to be able to comply with all these new rules and regulations, like, immediately?

This is about sowing chaos and confusion. My friends on the other side

know they are probably going to lose the next election, and they are going to lose big. Rather than live up to the reality or respect the voters, they are going to try to make up some conspiracy theory that the election was stolen or undocumented migrants came in and voted against them.

Here is the hard truth: If Republicans want to know why people are losing faith in our elections, they ought to look in the mirror. They ought to look in the mirror.

□ 1120

People are losing faith because Donald Trump, the election denier in chief, can't admit he lost. People are losing faith because Tulsi Gabbard and Kash Patel's FBI raided an election office in Fulton County, Georgia, based on recycled conspiracy theories. They seized 2020 election results, even though it was Donald Trump who asked the Georgia Secretary of State to find 11,780 ballots so that he can win, even though he lost, and that is on tape.

They are losing faith in our elections because they saw Pam Bondi trying to shake down Minnesota's State government, saying the administration would only withdraw ICE if Minnesota handed over their voter rolls to Trump's DOJ. They are losing faith because of bills like this, which force every State in America to give their voter rolls over to DHS Secretary Kristi Noem.

Let that sink in. She is probably one of the least trustworthy people in the country right now. I wouldn't trust Kristi Noem to tell me the correct time, and we are asking States to turn over their voting rolls to her. Give me a break.

We don't need any more lectures from Republicans about the sanctity of democracy or why people are losing faith in our democratic institutions. We know why, and we know what this bill is. This is Jim Crow 2.0. Republicans think that when fewer Americans vote, they win. It is as simple as that.

I am so sick of the other side just making things up. This widespread voter fraud conspiracy is all part of the same election denialism that goes right up to the Oval Office.

The other side has been making these claims for years now. We have heard about this for over a decade. They claim that massive numbers of noncitizens are voting, swaying elections, and that rampant voter fraud is changing results.

Every single one of those claims, Mr. Speaker, has been investigated again and again by Republican Governors and Republican Secretaries of State, by journalists, by academic researchers, and by President Trump himself, whose own voter fraud commission was disbanded because he couldn't find enough evidence to warrant the absurd allegations that he was making.

Every time these claims are investigated, they disappear like a mirage. This entire bill is fundamentally predi-

cated on a lie. In fact, when you crunch the numbers, you are more likely to be struck by lightning than to successfully impersonate someone at the polls. Enough already.

The SAVE America Act is a terrible bill that makes it harder for American citizens to participate in our democracy. That is it.

America does not want to be saved by a Republican Party that spent a year propping up Trump's tariffs, which have driven costs through the roof. We don't want to be saved by the people who continue covering up for pedophiles in the Epstein files. America certainly doesn't want to be saved by the same people who still can't get over losing the 2020 election so they are going to try to rig the next one.

Go save somebody else, but we don't want this garbage. We will fight like hell to stop you from making it harder for millions of Americans to register to vote.

We know why you are doing this. It is because you are afraid that you are going to lose in November. Well, too bad. Too bad. Either change your crappy policies or face the voters and deal with the consequences of your own actions. Those are the only two options in a democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President and to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, that was a whole lot of words to say my Democratic colleagues don't want only citizens to vote and don't like voter ID.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE).

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the SAVE America Act, which implements commonsense measures backed by the vast majority of Americans, across party lines, to secure our elections and ensure that it is easy to vote but hard to cheat.

As my great State of Georgia knows all too well, we must do more to deliver secure elections. The survival of our constitutional Republic relies on free, fair, and secure elections.

Thankfully, this legislation bolsters election integrity by requiring a government photo ID to vote, requiring proof of U.S. citizenship to register to vote, and directing States to remove noncitizens from existing voter rolls.

These are not controversial issues. In fact, leftwing CNN's own recent polling shows that 83 percent of Americans support voter ID, including the majority of Republicans and Democrats, as well as voters regardless of their race.

Who would oppose such a bill and why? Unsurprisingly, my Democrat colleagues oppose the SAVE America Act because it hurts the Democratic Party's ability to cheat in our elections.

Just think of all the things Americans need an ID for, yet face absolutely

no backlash from the Democratic Party. For example, to exercise another constitutional right, the Second Amendment, an individual must present a government-issued photo ID to purchase a firearm from a Federal firearms dealer. Yet, requiring identification to vote is somehow portrayed as controversial.

To underscore the Democrats' hypocrisy even further, in funding negotiations, CHUCK SCHUMER and House Minority Leader HAKEEM JEFFRIES are demanding that ICE agents show IDs to arrest illegal aliens. They support photo ID to enforce immigration laws but oppose photo ID to ensure our elections are secure. This is incredible hypocrisy.

In Proverbs 11:9, God says: "The hypocrite with his mouth destroys his neighbor." That is exactly what Democrats are trying to do: destroy this country with their hypocrisy over voter identification.

Mr. Speaker, I support this act.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me first correct the gentleman from Texas, who mischaracterized deliberately my remarks. I made it very clear in my opening, and I will read it again to him, that if noncitizens are voting in Federal elections, they should be prosecuted. We all believe it. He doesn't have to listen if he doesn't want to, but please don't mischaracterize what I said.

Mr. Speaker, I am looking over to the other side of the aisle and can't help but be stunned by the number of people over there who I remember coming on this floor and denying the election results in the year 2020 because they didn't like the results.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge that we defeat the previous question. If we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to make in order amendment No. 10 to the SAVE America Act, which prohibits Members of Congress, the President, the Vice President, their spouses, and dependents from owning or trading stocks.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, to discuss our proposal, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MORELLE), the sponsor of the amendment and the ranking member of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my longtime friend, the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee, for his vigorous defense of our position and his encouragement that people vote against the so-called SAVE America Act.

Mr. Speaker, the way to enhance Americans' trust in government is by

holding ourselves to a higher standard, not by disenfranchising citizens seeking to participate in our democracy.

The vast majority of Americans believe that it is time to end the practice of Members of Congress and the President and Vice President from trading stocks, and that is what the Restore Trust in Government Act would do.

Speaker JOHNSON has refused to move any bill to ban Member stock trading. I offered this proposal as an amendment to the SAVE America Act, but it was rejected by the majority.

I also have a discharge petition on stock trading that has over 170 signatures, nearing the 218 signatures needed to pass the House. If we want Americans to trust us, to trust our government, we need to root out corruption, real corruption, not imaginary voter fraud.

We have an opportunity to do that right here and right now. That is what the Restore Trust in Government Act would do.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to recognize the importance of the moment and to defeat the previous question. Once we do, the House can finally pass a stock trading ban.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am about to yield 2 minutes to my friend from Arizona, but I will just note that, as one of the lead sponsors of the legislation to deal with prohibiting Members of Congress from engaging in the act of trading in stocks, we are working on a bipartisan basis. We have legislation we are going to move. There will be a time to do that, and this is a complete substitute. In other words, this is fake.

It is a bunch of drama because my colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not want voter identification to be used to vote, and they do not want to guarantee that only citizens vote. It is that simple.

□ 1130

Mr. Speaker, we will deal with stock trading. I am one of the lead sponsors of that legislation. We will get it done but not as a substitute for what 80 percent of American people want, which is to guarantee only citizens vote and that they show up with a voter identification.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas, Mr. ROY, for yielding 2 minutes to me.

Mr. Speaker, I will say this. This is really humorous to hear the machinations and the twisting and goings-on from our friends across the aisle. As they say, this is too much.

Mr. SCHUMER denigrated Black people and basically said they can't get the IDs. Kamala Harris said rural folks can't get IDs. It is just too hard. That is BS. They know it is BS. The American people know it is BS. It is exactly

why 85 percent of Americans say we need to do this.

Let me just say that I come from a State that is the most unique State in the country because we have been, for years, requiring proof of citizenship when a person registers for a State ballot. We have to do that in Arizona, and we have had no suppression. We are the only State that does it because the Supreme Court ruled that way. Somehow, we can't do it for Federal ballots?

Mr. Speaker, think about that. For an alderman or legislator in Arizona, we have to show proof of citizenship to register to vote. We can't do it for the President, though. How absurd is that?

We have had no problems. There has been no voter suppression. They want to make it an issue because they don't want that proof, and we need to have that proof. Every rational American knows it is not suppression. It is common sense. That is why we need to show ID when we vote. It is popular in Arizona. It is popular across the country.

We need to show our citizenship when we register to vote. That is what has to happen in Arizona. It will work across the country. There is not a doubt in my mind, and I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let's talk about common sense for a second. When the gentleman from Texas introduced this bill, the effective date was in 2027. All of a sudden, because, I think, a right-winger on their side did a tweet that caused all kinds of chaos, they moved for it to take effect immediately, notwithstanding the fact we have primaries beginning in some States in a matter of just a few weeks.

I would just point out to the gentleman who just spoke that we have this thing called a Real ID. For 20 years, we have been trying to implement it. We spent billions of dollars trying to implement it and still not everybody has it. It has taken 20 years. My colleagues are pushing all these new changes on States. They have to do it in a matter of a couple of weeks?

We all know what this is about. We all know what this is about. People see through this. This is not about protecting our democracy. It is not about preventing undocumented immigrants from voting. That is already illegal in this country. This is about sowing confusion and chaos because they know they are going to lose the next election. What an underhanded way to deal with elections in our democracy. What an insult to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. SIMON).

Ms. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill doesn't secure elections. It shrinks the electorate. I find it so interesting that in real time we are having this conversation. When we talk about Black voters, we are going to talk about Black voters.

This bill was written so poorly it doesn't even take into consideration women of all races who changed their names when they got married. It is ridiculous.

It has been a Federal crime, we know, for noncitizens to vote since 1996. Georgia audited 8.2 million voter registrations and found 20 noncitizens, Mr. Speaker, 20. That is the emergency. That is the emergency that justifies blocking 21 million American citizens who don't have the papers to fill what this bill demands. We all know the history.

Darnella Cavaness, my grandmother from Malvern, Arkansas, had to face the poll tax. After Reconstruction, nobody wrote the word "race" into a single suppression statute. They wrote poll taxes. They wrote literacy tests, good character clauses. It was all race neutral on paper but devastating in practice.

The SAVE America Act sits in that tradition. I will say it again. The SAVE America Act sits in that tradition.

I have a 14-year-old daughter. I won't stand here and make voting harder for her when she decides to register to vote.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't get to shrink the franchise. I urge a strong "no" from all of our colleagues who believe in a democracy that we were all promised.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the SAVE America Act. This essential legislation would require, as we have said previously, proof of citizenship when registering to vote and the presentation of a valid ID when at the ballot box. Currently, only 13 States do not require any form of voter ID. Having this requirement should be the standard and not the exception.

My Democratic colleagues claim that requiring a photo ID to vote is too burdensome. Some say it is too difficult for rural Americans and will lead to voter suppression. I grew up in rural America.

The reality is that Americans use photo IDs every day to carry out basic tasks like opening a bank account, boarding a flight, checking into a hotel, renting a car, or applying for a business license.

Americans use photo IDs to buy alcohol, tobacco, or nicotine products. They use it to sign a lease or rental agreement. It is also used to get a marriage license, purchase firearms or ammunition, check in for jury duty, or enroll in a college or university. Purchasing insurance or donating blood requires a photo ID.

I hope that people who don't have a photo ID don't get sick because they need a photo ID to purchase things like Sudafed, NyQuil, and Mucinex D. I hope they don't have to pick up a pack-

age at the post office because we have to have a photo ID to pick up a package at the post office.

If we require a photo ID to prevent fraud in these areas I just mentioned, why are my colleagues so opposed to preventing fraud in elections? It is hard to argue that a photo ID is too much to ask for in voting when Americans already use it routinely for far less important activities.

Mr. Speaker, protecting election integrity should be a priority. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying SAVE America Act to secure our elections.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 18½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 15½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from "ABC News" titled: "Election Fact Check: Noncitizens Can't Vote, and Instances Are 'Vanishingly Rare.'"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[From ABC News, Oct. 28, 2024]

ELECTION FACT CHECK: NONCITIZENS CAN'T VOTE, AND INSTANCES ARE 'VANISHINGLY RARE'

(By Peter Charalambous)

Former President Donald Trump and Republican leaders across the country have for months characterized the alleged scourge of noncitizen voting as a pressing threat to a free and fair election, using heated rhetoric to suggest that widespread illegal voting could tilt the scales toward Democrats in November.

But a spate of GOP-led inquiries in the weeks leading up to Election Day tell a different story, one that experts have long insisted is true: Noncitizen voting is extraordinarily rare.

Recent audits of voter rolls in states including Georgia, Ohio, and Iowa uncovered instances of noncitizen voting that overall amounted to only a tiny fraction of the states' overall number of registered voters.

A comprehensive audit of Georgia's voter rolls—which include 8.2 million registered voters uncovered 20 noncitizens who registered to vote, including nine instances when noncitizens actually cast a ballot. A similar audit of Iowa's 2.3 million voters revealed 87 instances where individuals cast ballots and later self-reported as noncitizens.

In Ohio, the state's attorney general, Dave Yost, recently announced indictments against six alleged noncitizens who had voted in a national election, after Ohio Secretary of State Frank LaRose identified 597 alleged noncitizens who had registered to vote in the state. Each of the six defendants were lawful residents but lacked citizenship when they voted.

"Irregularities like this are rare, and this is a small number of cases," Yost said on Tuesday. "We should all be confident in the upcoming election, knowing that the laws are being enforced and will continue to be enforced."

The nationwide push to root out noncitizen voting comes as Trump has made noncitizen voting a key part of his campaign message, telling his supporters that undocumented immigrants are set to vote in record num-

bers during the upcoming presidential election.

"Our elections are bad," Trump said at the ABC News presidential debate in September. "And a lot of these illegal immigrants coming in, they're trying to get them to vote. They can't even speak English, they don't know even know what country they're in practically, and these people are trying to get them to vote, and that's why they're allowing them to come into our country."

But with noncitizen voting in national elections already illegal and rare, critics have pointed to Trump's rhetoric and the national focus on noncitizen voting as an attempt to intentionally sow distrust and lay the potential groundwork for litigation to challenge the results of the election.

"It amounts to a vanishingly rare phenomenon that is not going to impact the outcome of our elections in any real way, and where the people who actually are violating the law are held accountable," said Sean Morales-Doyle, a voting rights expert at the Brennan Center for Justice, a non-profit think tank. "Both domestic and foreign folks are spreading these lies in order to undermine faith in American elections—some of them with the hope of overturning the result if they're not happy about it."

Across a sample of 23.5 million votes cast in 42 jurisdictions during the 2016 election, election officials identified 30 incidents of suspected noncitizen voting that were referred for further investigation, comprising 0.0001% of the total votes cast, according to a 2017 Brennan Center study. When Georgia audited its voter rolls in 2022, election officials were unable to identify a single instance of a noncitizen casting a ballot during an election.

Noncitizens are prohibited from voting in federal elections by a 1996 law that penalizes offenders with heavy fines, up to one year in prison, and deportation, which Morales-Doyle says further disincentivizes the crime.

"The payoff is casting one ballot in one election," Morales-Doyle said. "It is just mind-boggling to think that someone who has decided to move themselves and their family to the United States and try to build a life here is going to risk all of that, risk their freedom and their presence in the United States, to cast one ballot in one election."

Despite instances of noncitizen voting being rare and steeply penalized, Trump has made baseless claims that Democrats are allowing illegal immigration to encourage voter fraud in the upcoming election—a claim echoed by Republican allies such as House Speaker Mike Johnson.

"I think that ultimately they hope to turn all these illegals into voters for their side. It sounds sinister, but there's no other explanation for what's happening down there," said Johnson, who last month unsuccessfully tried to pass the SAVE Act to require documented proof of citizenship to vote.

Election experts have expressed concerns about states using unreliable data to flag and purge ineligible voters, which can accidentally ensnare eligible voters—such as Alabama resident Roald Hazelhoff, who became a citizen two years ago.

As Hazelhoff—who immigrated from Holland in the 1970s before putting down roots in Alabama and raising three children—was preparing to cast his ballot in his first national election earlier this year, he received a letter from the Alabama secretary of state notifying him that he was ineligible to vote. "This is intimidating," Hazelhoff told ABC News about the letter, which referred him for potential criminal prosecution because he registered to vote despite being previously issued a noncitizen identification number decades ago.

"If it happens in Venezuela, then you might expect a little bit of that," he said. "It should not be happening here. It just shouldn't."

Over the last month, the Department of Justice successfully stopped Alabama and Virginia from removing suspected noncitizens from their voter rolls because the purges violate federal law prohibiting states from striking names from voter registrations within 90 days of an election. Federal judges in both states have ordered election officials to restore the voter registrations of thousands of voters, including Hazelhoff.

"The evidence is out there that there is a very small percentage of individuals and organizations that are trying to derail the democratic process, and this is an example of it," Hazelhoff said. "It's misguided but it's also dangerous and it's intimidating."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from NPR titled: "Despite grand claims, a new report shows noncitizen voting hasn't materialized."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[From NPR, July 30, 2025]

DESPITE GRAND CLAIMS, A NEW REPORT SHOWS NONCITIZEN VOTING HASN'T MATERIALIZED

(By Miles Parks)

After President Trump and many other Republicans warned that vast numbers of non-U.S. citizens would influence last year's election, states and law enforcement have devoted more resources than ever before to root out those ineligible voters.

More than six months into Trump's second term, they haven't found much.

New research out Wednesday tracking state government efforts across the country confirms what election experts have said all along: Noncitizen voting occasionally happens but in minuscule numbers, and not in any coordinated way.

"Noncitizens are not a large threat to our election system currently," said David Becker, the executive director of the Center for Election Innovation & Research (CEIR), which conducted the research. "Even states that are looking everywhere to try to amplify the numbers of noncitizens . . . when they actually look, they find a surprisingly, shockingly small number."

CEIR spent roughly four months reviewing states' public disclosures about noncitizen voting, stretching back years. The organization shared its findings with NPR exclusively.

The report shows a wide disparity in how states have investigated the issue and what data officials in those states choose to make public. Many states have released no information, even though it's illegal for noncitizens to vote in federal elections and all voting officials do some type of maintenance to their voter rolls.

Some states, such as Michigan and Georgia, have undertaken audits of their entire voter rolls, using resources from the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to check for noncitizens. Michigan officials announced in April that a review found that "cases of noncitizens casting a ballot in Michigan elections are extremely rare." The review found more than a dozen noncitizens appear to have illegally voted in the 2024 general election. That's 0.00028 percent of the state's total votes.

"We want to have no evidence of people who aren't eligible voting in our elections,"

Michigan Secretary of State Jocelyn Benson, a Democrat who's now running for governor, said in an interview after the audit was completed. "But this is a serious issue and it has to be addressed with a scalpel, not a sledgehammer."

DHS recently expanded and simplified the tool the agency offers states for those sorts of citizenship checks, so it's likely more states will perform similar audits in the future, though questions remain about how accurate the tool's new features are when it comes to citizenship verification.

Many conservatives say expanded security measures are also needed since one noncitizen vote is too many. But the CEIR report also details how officials in numerous Republican-controlled states last summer leaned into the sort of baseless narratives that Trump and Elon Musk were pushing about noncitizen voting by releasing inflated numbers of "potential" noncitizen voters.

In each case, Becker said, "you start seeing as they proceed and as we get past the political season—as the candidate that they supported gets elected—the numbers go down."

In Texas, "1,930 potential noncitizen" voters last summer turned this year into investigations into more than 100 potential noncitizen voters.

In Alabama last August, the secretary of state removed more than 3,000 supposed noncitizens from the state's rolls, only to be ordered by a judge to stop that program when thousands of those people were found to be U.S. citizens.

"The vast majority of allegations of noncitizen registration or voting appear to arise from misunderstandings, mischaracterizations, or outright fabrications about complex voter data," the CEIR report finds.

The report also noted that 18 states, which span the political spectrum, have not publicly disclosed finding or removing any noncitizen voters on their rolls.

No state has found any coordinated effort to get noncitizens to vote in the 2024 election.

When UCLA election law professor Rick Hasen was presented with the CEIR findings, he said he wasn't "surprised in the slightest."

"It really is not a big problem, both because on the individual level, it would be hard to get noncitizens to agree to it," Hasen said. "And on the broader level, it's just not a very cost-effective way to try to I steal an election."

Election officials note there are safeguards to prevent noncitizens from registering to vote, but the biggest deterrent is the fact that immigrants without legal status generally don't want to risk deportation to cast one ballot—especially because the inherent paper trail of voting makes it very easy to get caught.

Separate research has found that when noncitizens do register to vote, it's often due to bureaucratic errors or a misunderstanding about eligibility, as opposed to intentional fraud.

Still, the noncitizen voting myth has persisted for more than 100 years in American elections. Hasen expects it to come up again in 2026, even if states don't find any data to support it.

"Most people who make claims that noncitizen voting is a big problem are doing so for political purposes," Hasen said. "It's a way of demonizing immigrants. It's a way of trying to claim that Democrats cheat. And no amount of evidence is going to stop people from making politically expedient claims."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the

RECORD an article from the Cato Institute titled: "Noncitizens Don't Illegally Vote in Detectable Numbers."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[From the CATO Blog Institute, Nov. 25, 2020]

NONCITIZENS DON'T ILLEGALLY VOTE IN DETECTABLE NUMBERS
(By Alex Nowrasteh)

One of the most frequent and less serious criticisms that comes across my desk is that immigration is bad because non-citizens vote illegally in such large numbers that sway elections. A new report by James D. Agresti, pushed by some news outlets, argues that the number of noncitizens who illegally voted in 2020 substantially increased Biden's vote share but did not affect the outcome of the election. It has been illegal for non-citizens to vote for federal elected officials since 1996, so these noncitizen voters would all be breaking federal law. Is the Agresti paper reliable? Are large numbers of noncitizens voting in federal elections to such an extent that several states voted for Biden as a result?

No, but to understand why you have to follow how the Agresti paper arrived at its conclusion. The Agresti report relies on a peer-reviewed academic paper by political scientists Jesse T. Richman, Gulshan A. Chattha, and David C. Earnest that was published in 2014 that estimates the rate at which noncitizens voted for president in 2008. Their paper relies upon responses to the Cooperative Congressional Election Study (CCES) for the 2008 election that found a substantial proportion of noncitizens voted in that year. The Agresti paper combined two figures from the Richman, Chattha, and Earnest paper to get their primary estimate that 15.8 percent of non-citizens voted in 2008. Agresti then applies that 15.8 percent rate to the non-citizen population in swing states in 2020 to reach their conclusion.

The big problem, as explained in two succinct pieces, is that non-citizens voting illegally is a small subset of a small population of Americans measured in the CCES survey. In the CCES survey, as in any survey, a certain number of respondents click the wrong box. Thus, some respondents will incorrectly click that they are non-citizens by accident and that they voted. Or they will make any number of other errors. This general problem is called measurement error and it afflicts every survey. These errors are common in surveys, but if it surveys enough people and there isn't a tragic flaw in design that causes large numbers of people to make the same error, then it doesn't matter much for the final result.

The problem is that the authors focused on a small number of non-citizens in a very large survey that likely accidentally said they were noncitizens who voted when they were really citizens who voted. The CCES survey asked about 20,000 people how they voted and about 19,500 of them said that they were U.S. citizens. Since the CCES is about federal elections, it oversamples citizens who can vote and under sample non-citizens who can't vote. In fact, the number of reported non-citizens in the CCES survey who said they voted in a federal election is just about exactly the number who should have misidentified themselves as non-citizens in such a large survey.

This problem arises because the survey was not designed to sample non-citizens, and the non-citizen category in the citizenship question is included for completeness and to identify those respondents who might be

non-citizens. We expect that most of that group are in fact non-citizens (85 of 105), but the very low level of misclassification of citizens, who comprise 97.4 percent of the sample, means that we expect that 19 “non-citizen” respondents (16.5 percent of all reported non-citizens) are citizens who are misclassified. And, those misclassified people can readily account for the observed vote among those who reported that they are non-citizens.

Survey misuse, misdesign, and misinterpretation is a serious problem that we all witnessed right after the 2020 election. This strain of research appears to be another instance of that. There are likely many problems with America’s voting system and there is no doubt that a non-zero number of non-citizens illegally voted, but there is no good evidence that noncitizens voted illegally in large enough numbers to actually shift the outcome of elections or even change the number of electoral votes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD another piece from the Cato Institute titled: “Trump’s Claims About Noncitizen Voting Are False. We Can Prove It.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[From the CATO Commentary Institute®, Feb. 5, 2026]

TRUMP’S CLAIMS ABOUT NONCITIZENS VOTING ARE FALSE. WE CAN PROVE IT.

(By Stephen Richer)

This week, President Trump called on his party to nationalize American elections, an unconstitutional move that he said would be justified because of the danger of noncitizens casting ballots. “These people were brought to our country to vote, and they vote illegally,” he said.

No president has so baldly proposed to intervene in state elections, but the charge that noncitizens are illegally casting ballots is sadly commonplace. Elon Musk claims on X, without evidence, that significant numbers of illegal immigrants vote. Rudy Giuliani erroneously alleged that my home state, Arizona, had allowed “probably about 250,000” votes from noncitizens in 2020, despite the fact that Arizona has long required proof of citizenship to vote in state elections.

Election officials usually respond to these allegations by pointing out that there are almost no prosecutions of fraudulent noncitizen voters. Reuters has noted that even the pro-Trump Heritage Foundation’s database of election crimes listed only 24 instances of noncitizens voting in U.S. elections from 2003 to 2023. While these rebuttals are correct, they are incomplete: Just because something isn’t prosecuted doesn’t mean it doesn’t happen. Happily, there is new compelling evidence debunking the false claims. Recently, a number of states have undertaken investigations into noncitizen voting, cross-checking voter rolls with citizenship status, and found it virtually nonexistent.

When confronted with allegations on non-citizens voting in Utah, Lt. Gov. Deidre Henderson, the state’s top election official, initiated a months-long review of Utah’s approximately 2.1 million registered voters. She and her team found one “confirmed noncitizen.” Just one. And that one noncitizen, while registered, had never voted.

Idaho, a state of one million voters, ran similar tests in 2024, and they found 36 “very likely” registered noncitizens. That may seem like a lot until you view it in light of

claims that statewide elections are altered by such anomalies. Some, but not all, of those 36 people have previously voted, the secretary of state, Phil McGrane, said, but “out of the million-plus registered voters we started with, we’re down to 10 thousandths of a percent” of the overall count—not even close to affecting the outcome.

Louisiana’s investigation in 2025 netted some 390 noncitizen registrants, 79 of whom had voted in at least one election over the last several decades (out of 2.9 million registrants). Just a few weeks ago, Montana found 23 possible noncitizen registrants (out of approximately 785,000 people registered). And Georgia, in some ways the model for these investigations, found in its 2024 audit 20 registered noncitizens (out of 8.2 million registrations). In my four years in office in Maricopa County overseeing voter registration, I came across a total of two possible instances of noncitizens voting out of some 2.5 million registered voters.

Some politicians are trying to exploit even these small numbers. In Michigan, the Macomb County clerk, Anthony Forlini, who is running for the top election office in the state, the secretary of state, recently announced to great fanfare that he’d found 15 noncitizens on his county’s voter rolls of over 724,000 registered voters. The incumbent secretary of state, Jocelyn Benson, then tasked her team with investigating the 15 files. It found that three of the people were U.S. citizens, four were previously removed from voter rolls, four were under further investigation and four do seem to be noncitizens.

These investigations affirm what is simply common sense. People largely aren’t willing to risk their status in the United States—the land of economic opportunity—for the ability to cast one more vote out of hundreds of thousands or millions in a state and hundreds of millions in the country.

The investigations also suggest that many politicians and public interest groups, all of which have access to these reports, may not actually care that much about election security. The constant talk of noncitizen voting is more likely about scoring political points and bolstering fund-raising.

Playing politics with the idea of fraudulent voters and stolen elections comes at a real cost to American confidence in our elections. It’s an affront to our democracy and to all those who work to deliver free and fair elections. It’s also an ominous sign for where things may be heading this year.

For President Trump, the myth of noncitizens voting is part of the broader story he’s concocted to avoid accepting that he lost to Joe Biden in 2020. But it also appears to be about this fall’s election. Mr. Trump may well intend to send the F.B.I. to run elections in Fulton County, Ga., or the Department of Homeland Security to seize ballot tabulators from Los Angeles County.

I don’t think it’s likely he will do so. But I also wouldn’t have predicted that the F.B.I. would take hundreds of boxes of 2020 election materials from Fulton County, as it did last week. And I certainly wouldn’t have predicted that Republicans would attempt to derail the electoral count on Jan. 6, 2021.

Everyone—Democrats and Republicans—should use the new state-level proof that noncitizen voting is virtually nonexistent to push back against the real danger to our democracy: craven politicians using the issue to undermine our free and fair elections.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from the American Immigration Council titled: “Unpacking Myths About Noncitizen Voting—How Heritage Foundation’s Own Data Proves It’s Not a Problem.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[From the American Immigration Council, Aug. 1, 2024]

UNPACKING MYTHS ABOUT NONCITIZEN VOTING—HOW HERITAGE FOUNDATION’S OWN DATA PROVES IT’S NOT A PROBLEM

(By Aaron Reichlin-Melnick)

Over the last decade, many politicians have called for overhauling the United States’ election systems by mandating strict voter ID for both registering to vote and actual voting. Many have justified this stance by either claiming the U.S. election system is vulnerable to fraud, or that fraud is already a common occurrence. In May, House Speaker Mike Johnson even said that, despite a lack of evidence, he knows “intuitively” that “a lot of illegals are voting in federal elections.” Throughout the Republican National Convention in July, similar claims abounded.

However, a close examination of the evidence put forward by proponents of these strict limitations on voting shows just how extraordinarily rare noncitizen voting truly is—and how there is no burning need to impose new restrictions on access to voting.

The conservative Heritage Foundation has campaigned hard against “voter fraud,” it proudly championed legislation passed by the House in July which would mandate the use of photo ID for all voter registration. Importantly, it also maintains a database of 1,546 “proven instances of voter fraud,” where Heritage researchers have collected criminal cases which have been brought against people who have committed some kind of electoral fraud, either registering to vote or voting when ineligible.

It’s this database—created and maintained by Heritage itself—that helps reveal how there is no crisis of noncitizen voting.

A close review of the cases in Heritage’s database reveal that the organization has documented just 68 total cases of noncitizen voting going back to the earliest cases documented in the 1980s. That’s less than 5 percent of the cases in their database, total. The remaining cases all involve U.S. citizens.

What do those 68 cases tell us? First, it demonstrates that proven cases of noncitizen voting are incredibly rare. Even an organization engaged in a major effort to document voter fraud produced fewer than 70 proven cases of noncitizens who voted in elections in the last 40 years. Given that over one billion votes have been cast over that period in thousands of elections, the incidence of proven noncitizen voting is below 0.0001 percent.

This is in line with other analysis carried out following recent elections. For example, a 2017 Brennan Center analysis of 42 jurisdictions which tabulated 23.5 million votes in the 2016 election found that noncitizens were referred for investigation in just 30 cases—or 0.0001 percent of votes.

Second, the data also tells us that proven cases of undocumented immigrants voting in elections are even rarer. Just 10 undocumented immigrants in total appear in the Heritage database for unlawful voting. Further investigation outside the database has uncovered one other instance; an elderly Cuban man with a work permit but no permanent lawful status, who was encouraged to vote by a poll worker in 2016. Several of the other 10 cases involve a person living under an assumed name and identity of a U.S. citizen or obtaining citizenship through fraudulent documentation. In those circumstances, the person voted under the identity of U.S. citizen with valid evidence of

status—even though they were not the person they claimed to be.

Third, the data tells us that most cases of noncitizen voting involve lawful permanent residents—people with green cards who have been in the community for years, many who end up voting due to bad information given by government officials themselves.

The most common scenario in the cases included in Heritage's database includes a lawful permanent resident who was encouraged by a government official to vote or falsely told that they were eligible.

For example, following the 2016 election, prosecutors in North Carolina conducted an extensive audit and charged 19 people with voting without being a citizen. Nearly all were lawful permanent residents who had not intended to violate the law. One defendant had already passed his citizenship test but had been turned away from the oath ceremony because the room was full and falsely thought he was already a U.S. citizen. Another defendant was a 70-year-old woman from South Korea who was encouraged to vote by a fellow church member and who was never turned away at a poll center despite presenting her green card as ID. In nearly all of these cases, the person pled guilty to misdemeanor offenses and were fined less than \$1,000.

The lessons to take from Heritage's own database are that noncitizen voting is not a serious problem and that to the extent rare cases occur, they would be best addressed by better training government workers to recognize immigration documents and follow procedure. The majority of the proven cases in the Heritage database would never have happened but for government workers making mistakes, yet few of the policies proposed by Heritage would even resolve these issues.

Thus, given that only an infinitesimally small number of noncitizens erroneously vote each election, politicians should abandon a misguided effort to transform our electoral systems at high expense and extremely low benefit.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an excerpt from an academic article from the journal on Electoral Studies titled: "An exploration of Donald Trump's allegations of massive voter fraud in the 2016 election," which finds:

" . . . expansive voter fraud concerns espoused by Donald Trump and those aligned with him are not grounded in any observable features of the 2016 election."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[From the Electoral Studies]

AN EXPLORATION OF DONALD TRUMP'S ALLEGATIONS OF MASSIVE VOTER FRAUD IN THE 2016 GENERAL ELECTION

(By David Cottrell, Michael C. Herron, Sean J. Westwood)

ABSTRACT

As Republican candidate for president and later 45th President of the United States, Donald Trump has claimed repeatedly and vociferously that the 2016 General Election was tainted by massive voter fraud. Here we use aggregate election statistics to study Trump's claims and focus on non-citizen populations across the country, state-specific allegations directed at California, New Hampshire, and Virginia, and the timing of election results. Consistent with existing lit-

erature, we do not uncover any evidence supportive of Trump's assertions about systematic voter fraud in 2016. Our results imply neither that there was no fraud at all in the 2016 General Election nor that this election's administration was error-free. They do strongly suggest, however, that the expansive voter fraud concerns espoused by Donald Trump and those allied with him are not grounded in any observable features of the 2016 election.

In addition to winning the Electoral College in a landslide, I won the popular vote if you deduct the millions of people who voted illegally—Donald Trump, November 27, 2016

1. INTRODUCTION

Regular and fair elections are the keystones of democratic governance (Lipset, 1959; Katz, 1997). These mechanisms translate voter preferences and opinions into elected officials, who ultimately make policy. Electoral fraud distorts the relationship between constituents and representatives, and for this reason alone the threat of voter fraud is inherently serious. Moreover, elections perceived as unfair can decrease electoral legitimacy (Norris, 2014), reduce governmental credibility (Magaloni, 2010), and undermine perceptions of voter efficacy (Elklit and Reynolds, 2002).

Insofar as it was repeatedly tarred by allegations of widespread voter fraud, the 2016 American General Election exemplifies these concerns. Despite a dearth of evidence that fraudulently cast ballots play an important role in American elections (e.g., Levitt, 2007; Minnite, 2010; Goel et al., 2016), as the Republican nominee for president Donald Trump claimed that he was at risk of losing the presidential contest to Democratic rival Hillary Clinton because of systematic voter fraud. Later as president-elect, Trump asserted that Clinton had received "millions" of improper votes, and he blamed his loss of the popular vote on illegal activity. And finally, as the 45th President of the United States, Trump asserted that voting in New Hampshire was tainted by fraud and that, in the absence of illegal Massachusetts voters, Trump would have won the Granite State's four electoral votes and then-United States Senator Kelly Ayotte, who lost a close election to former New Hampshire governor Maggie Hassan, would have been reelected.

Trump's expansive claims merit attention because of the role that elections play in democratic politics and on account of Trump's status—45th President of the United States. Moreover, assertions of voter fraud are a significant source of political division and conflict in American politics (Hasen, 2012; Bentele and O'Brien, 2013; Hicks et al., 2014), and they are believed by a non-trivial segment of the voting population (Ansolabehere and Persily, 2008; Stewart et al., 2016). Lastly, simply because there was little voter fraud prior to November, 2016, does not imply perforce that Trump's claims are necessarily vacuous; it is always possible that 2016 was the first year in which systematic voter fraud was a meaningful factor in a presidential contest. These points motivated us in mid-2016 to develop an election fraud research project premised on the question, what could we academics say about election fraud in the aftermath of the then-upcoming presidential election? Our concern as of the summer of 2016 was that Trump might suffer a close loss in his bid for the presidency and react by leveling widespread accusations of voter fraud that, in principle, could explain his defeat at the polls.

Given the tenor of the Clinton-Trump presidential contest at the time of the Republican and Democratic party conventions, we anticipated post-election fraud allegations that centered on illegal voters, in particular

non-citizens. To prepare ourselves to scrutinize such allegations, we assembled a county-level dataset that included historical election returns, demographics, and economic indicators. We also contracted with the Associated Press so that we would be able to access their national database on county presidential election returns. Our plan was to begin work on fraud allegations on Election Day evening (November 8, 2016), and we were prepared for an intense post-election week or two.

Since Its inception, our research project has evolved in reaction to two developments. First Trump did not lose the 2016 presidential election; this relieved us of the pressure to investigate fraud allegations made in the aftermath of a close Trump loss. Second, and seemingly in spite of his victory, Trump continued to invoke the specter of widespread voter fraud. This latter development has spurred on our project, the result of which is this article.

We would like to draw particular attention to our use of the term, "widespread," in the sense of what we are calling allegations of widespread voter fraud. Donald Trump, as candidate and then later as president, has not anchored his voter fraud claims on the likelihood of a person, here or there, voting illegally. Rather, Trump and key supporters have spoken literally of "millions" of illegal votes, as our introductory quote makes clear. With this as context, our research project, an attempt to introduce scientific rigor into a debate largely dominated by bombastic claims, is not aimed at ferreting out what one might argue are more minor instances of voter fraud. While all instances of voter fraud are troubling, not all frauds are pivotal and not all frauds are systematic and widespread. Our research focuses solely on the possibility of massive and systematic fraud because fraud of this type in principle had the potential to be pivotal to the 2016 presidential election and because this is precisely the type of fraud against which Trump and his supporters, both before and after November, 2016, have regularly inveighed.

One can think of the analysis that follows as the proverbial canary, one that is an appropriate yet far-from-final step on the path of testing for voter fraud in the 2016 General Election. Detailed, individual-level audits, conducted on random samples of voters across jurisdictions spanning the United States, might be the ideal method to test for instances of voter fraud. However, in the absence of such audits, our analysis of aggregate county voting represents a valuable start. As will be clear shortly, we leverage variation in election outcomes across thousands of counties and connect that variation to a litany of explanatory variables, including counts of non-citizens provided by the American Community Survey. In the absence of a very expensive—and possibly unfeasible—audit of voter lists in jurisdictions across the United States, we believe that our aggregate analysis provides a significant advance in testing claims of voter fraud.

One could argue that an alternative method for testing voter fraud allegations would be to leverage a large-scale survey that questions respondents about say, citizenship status and voting history. Such a survey would have the benefit of assessing the eligibility of voters individually as opposed to in the aggregate. However, unlike an audit, a survey in this vein would depend on the accuracy of the information volunteered by its respondents. This dependence is exemplified by Richman et al. (2014), who use the Cooperative Congressional Election Study to analyze the voting behavior of self-identified non-citizens; drawing on survey data, they estimate that 1.2 million non-citizens voted

in the 2008 General Election. Ansolabehere et al. (2015) show, however, that this estimate reflects respondent data errors. Our use of aggregate data in conjunction with a corresponding lack of dependence on surveys allow us to avoid the sort of response problems that confound Richman, Chattha and Earnest.

We consider three allegations of voter fraud in the 2016 General Election: participation across the United States by non-citizens who supported Hillary Clinton in her presidential bid; concerns about voting in three states, California, New Hampshire, and Virginia, with particular attention to the possibility that Massachusetts voters tampered en masse with the United States Senate election in New Hampshire; and, finally, a conspiracy of election officials who attempted to “rig” the presidential election against Trump. The voter fraud accusations that we examine here span both national (non-citizen voting) and state-specific (e.g., New Hampshire), and all are associated with Donald Trump.

Briefly, we find little evidence consistent with widespread and systematic fraud fomented by non-citizens. Our analysis of returns in California, New Hampshire, and Virginia likewise turns up no evidence of problems in the vein raised by Donald Trump. And, our closer look at New Hampshire also yields nothing concrete. Lastly, and keeping in mind that the concern about a “rigged” election is ambiguous—we operationalized this idea by considering patterns in the way that election returns were released starting on the evening of November 8, 2016—we find no suspicious patterns in result timing.

Our results do not imply that there was no fraud at all in the 2016 presidential contest; indeed, we already know that the rate of fraud in the 2016 presidential election was not literally zero. Nor do our results imply that the administration of the 2016 General Election was error-free. Nonetheless, they do strongly suggest that Trump’s voter fraud allegations are not grounded in any observable features of the 2016 presidential election.

This article proceeds as follows. In the next section, we provide additional details on the motivation for and development of the research project whose results are described here. We then consider the aforementioned three sources of voter fraud, and we present results on them in sequence. Our final section concludes with suggestions for future research and how the academic community might want to consider studying voter fraud in upcoming elections.

2. STUDYING VOTER FRAUD: MOTIVATION AND PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

Allegations of voter fraud in the 2016 General Election from the Trump camp were alarmingly common. Beyond those already mentioned, Donald Trump and officials allied with him have asserted that records of deceased individuals are regularly used in the commission of voter fraud and insinuated that some urban areas, specifically Chicago, Philadelphia, and St. Louis, are hotbeds of fraudulent voting.

As Goel et al. (2016) summarize, there are three general classes of voter fraud: impersonation (a voter casts a ballot while claiming to be someone else), double-voting (an individual votes more than once), and ineligible voting (an individual who is not supposed to have access to the franchise in a particular location casts a ballot). A voter casting a ballot out of her jurisdiction is an example of the third type of fraud; this form of fraud would also characterize a citizen felon, who has lost the right to vote due to a state law restricting ex-felon voting rights (Manza and Uggen. 2006), improperly casting a ballot.

Efforts to uncover evidence of widespread voter fraud in American elections have come up empty. Surveys like Levitt (2007) and Minnite (2010) find only a small number of cases of verified voter fraud. Focusing on double-voting and using a database of 129 million individuals records, Goel et al. (2016) conclude that the maximum double-voting rate is approximate 0.02 percent and that “many, if not all, of [such] double votes could be a result of measurement error in turnout records” (p.30). Christensen and Schultz (2014) conclude that, “if [voter fraud] occurs, [it] is an isolated and rare occurrence in modern U.S. elections” (p. 313).

This literature notwithstanding, it is challenging to prove that rampant voter fraud does not exist. Indeed, proving a negative is in general a strenuous task. Even though existing findings on voter fraud are clear in the sense of not uncovering evidence of widespread conspiracies, one could always argue that scholars are simply looking in the wrong places. Providing proof of American citizenship, for example, is not needed when registering to vote in federal elections; instead, to register an individual needs only to swear under penalty of perjury that he or she is a citizen. Hence, it is theoretically possible for non-citizens to vote in federal elections in the United States and in so doing risk potential jail time and even deportation. Given the likelihood of being pivotal in an election, it is hard to believe that any non-citizen would want to behave in this way. Still, it remains the case that non-citizen voting is possible.

We know of no systematic audit of voter rolls that checks the citizenship status of individuals who voted. And it is not obvious how such an audit would proceed, give that there is no national identification system in the United States. Not all voters possess documents—like passports and birth certificates—that are definitive in the sense of proving citizenship. Thus, what one might call direct evidence of fraud might be difficult to come by, even in the presence of actual non-citizen voting.

While we lack the ability to verify the citizenship statuses of individual voters, we can nonetheless attempt to leverage the best data available to test national claims about widespread voter fraud. With this in mind, our research design and concomitant data are indirect insofar as our design seeks to identify downstream consequences of fraud as opposed to identifying directly which illegal voters cast ballots in the 2016 General Election.

If, as we wrote earlier, Trump were to have lost a dose election in November, 2016, and responded with accusations of fraud, there would be little time for election officials and scholars to respond to what might be serious accusations of impropriety. It is hard to imagine that a truly comprehensive study of voter fraud in any presidential election could be carefully executed prior to deadlines imposed by institutions such as the Electoral College. States were required, for example, to have resolved issues surrounding appointment of their Electors no later than December 13, 2016, six days prior to Elector meetings on December 19, 2016.

Given what seemed like a plausible scenario as of the summer of 2016, we designed our fraud project to be national in scope and, most importantly, not conditioned on a particular post-election fraud claim. In addition, our approach needed to be feasible given data typically available in the aftermath of a presidential election. We did not want to rely on comparisons between election returns and pre-election polls or exit polls because comparisons like this are inevitably confounded with questions about sampling frames and representativeness.

In light of these exigencies, in the summer and early fall of 2016 we assembled an extensive county-level data set on historical election returns and other county features. Our plan was, starting on the evening of November 8, 2016, and as returns began to trickle in, to seek a rationalization of the presidential election using tools typically applied by academics studying presidential elections. We would then ask, do we observe across the country large and systematic deviations from our rationalization in a way that is redolent of the forms of voter fraud that Trump was regularly citing during his then-presidential campaign? Did we observe post-election, for example, evidence at the county level that the presence of certain classes of non-citizens was associated with increased support for Clinton? If we were to observe nothing like this, we would be more confident—albeit not completely confident—that voter fraud in the fashion envisioned by Trump did not play a pivotal role in the 2016 presidential election.

As we noted in the introduction, our plan was interrupted by two events. First, Trump did not lose the 2016 presidential election. Second, and despite his Electoral College victory, Trump has continued to maintain that the election was affected by widespread fraud and in so doing has leveled some specific claims. With these two developments in mind, neither of which we expected as of the summer of 2016, our research design reflects both continuity and change. With respect to the former, below we report results from our exercise of looking nationwide for evidence of voter fraud associated with non-citizens and a “rigged” election. Conducting research in this vein was our plan since mid-2016, and it would be inappropriate to abrogate a research project on voter fraud because the anticipated loser of an election turned out to be the winner. And with respect to the latter, given the specificity of some of Donald Trump’s post-election claims about voter fraud, we decided to focus attention on these claims to check if there is evidence consistent with them. Overall, our research design represents a compromise between adhering to a pre-election plan and reacting to events that we could not have anticipated. We will return to this compromise in the conclusion, when we consider future efforts aimed at studying widespread voter fraud.

3. RESULTS

Our results are in three sections. First, we offer a county-level analysis that addresses Donald Trump’s claims about non-citizen voter fraud; allegations about non-citizens were promulgated pre-election, and we highlight the possibility of non-citizen voting in California, New Hampshire, and Virginia, three states which were mentioned explicitly by Trump post-election. Second, we continue our focus on states by analyzing a specific, post-election claim about New Hampshire. And third, we consider the timing of election results, and this reflects pre-election claims about a rigged election. What follows draws on many sources of data, all of which are listed in the appendix.

3.1. Non-citizen voting

Here we address the possibility of non-citizen voting in the 2016 presidential election. Counties are the smallest jurisdictions in the United States for which presidential election returns are tabulated nationally, and our non-citizen voting analysis is thus conducted at the county level. Among New England states, election results are tabulated by town, which in principle could push us in the direction of a town-level analysis (towns are in general smaller than counties). However, outside of election returns, the other variables we use in our non-citizen analysis are not nationally available below the level of county.

Counties are aggregate units that range in size from hundreds of residents to hundreds of thousands. This said, in an ideal world a study of non-citizen voting in the 2016 General Election might take the form of an individual-level audit where lists voters in this election are compared against lists of American citizens. We already mentioned this in the introduction and noted as well that we know of no publicly-available list of American citizens. This point notwithstanding, an individual-level study of non-citizen voting would avoid possible ecological fallacies that our aggregate analysis risks (e.g. Kramer, 1483). However, ballot secrecy makes it impossible to model vote choice at anything but the aggregate level. Accordingly, the majority of work on election outcomes relies on aggregate election data (e.g., Brians and Grofman 2001; Wand et al., 2001; Beber et al. 2012).

We drop counties not present in the Associated Press election returns database, meaning, the state of Alaska and Kalawao County, Hawaii. We also drop Oglala Lakota County, South Dakota, which experienced changes to its Census coding after 2010 and two Virginia localities, the city of Bedford and Bedford County, the latter of which incorporated the former prior to the 2016 General election. Of the 3142 counties and county equivalents in the United States, our non-citizen analysis covers 3,111, equivalent to a coverage rate of approximately 99 percent. To keep our language as straightforward as possible, henceforth we refer to counties and county equivalents simply as counties.

3.1.1. Modeling approach

Our non-citizen voting analysis is based on a series of linear regression models. These models consider differences between a 2016 election variable—i.e., Hillary Clinton's vote share—and a corresponding variable from a previous election—i.e., Barack Obama's vote share from the 2012 General Election. The reason we model differences, as opposed to levels, in our study of non-citizen voting in the 2016 presidential election is because, intuitively, the former represent features of the election that require explanation. Whether Clinton did well in a particular county in the United States may be noteworthy (if, in contrast, Obama did badly there) or not (Obama did well there, too). If we want to understand whether widespread fraud affected the 2016 presidential contest, we argue that we should study the difference between Clinton's and Obama's vote share, not simply Clinton's alone.

Formally, our regression study of non-citizen voting in 2016 is based on three dependent variables. These variables are as follows:

Difference in Democratic vote share: the difference between Clinton's share of the two-party vote in 2016 and Democratic presidential candidate Barack Obama's share of the two-party vote in 2012.

Difference in Democratic turnout: the difference between the number of votes received by Clinton in 2016 and the number of votes received by Democratic presidential candidate Barack Obama in 2012, divided by citizen voting age population.

Difference in Republican turnout: the difference between the number of votes received by Trump in 2016 and the number of votes received by Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney in 2012, divided by citizen voting age population.

Of the three dependent variables above, most important is the Clinton-Obama vote share difference. Per Donald Trump, noncitizens planned to turn out in November, 2016, and cast votes for Clinton. As such, the first place we should look for evidence of widespread non-citizen voter fraud is in an elevated Clinton vote share, relative to Obama,

in counties that contain disproportionately many non-citizens, *ceteris paribus*.

In terms of our second dependent variable, Trump's hypothesis of non-citizen voter fraud posits that, on account of ineligible voters casting ballots, there should be a surge (normalized by county size) in Democratic turnout in heavily non-citizens areas in the United States. If this were to have happened, then Clinton should have received more votes than Obama in counties with disproportionately many non-citizens, *ceteris paribus*.

We estimate a third regression with Trump-Romney turnout differences (total Trump votes from 2016 minus total Romney votes in 2012, normalized by county size) on its left hand side because this regression leads to a placebo test. Trump's theory of non-citizen voters is that they supported Hillary Clinton, not simply that non-citizens turned out to vote. With this in mind, a natural placebo test is one that involves the presence of non-citizens and Trump-Romney turnout differences. If we find evidence that counties with many non-citizens had disproportionately many Trump votes compared to Romney votes, *ceteris paribus*, that would indeed be odd. However, it would not look like the sort of non-citizen voter fraud that Trump predicted.

Our placebo test is useful because of potential misspecification problems in our regression analyses. These analyses are national in scope, which we believe is crucial, and purport to model election returns (vote share differences and turnout differences) in counties that differ from one another in size, partisanship, and economic conditions. Moreover, counties may differ in the extent to which their voters are politically mobilized, and this is very hard, if not impossible, to measure over the entire United States. Key political units in the country—United States Congressional Districts and state legislative districts, for example—do not coincide with county boundaries. This leads to a well-known problem in the study of American election administration: the geographies (counties) with the best data availability on socioeconomic variables are not units (for example, Congressional Districts) with particularly good political data (Chen, 2017).

Each presidential election is unique in some fashion, and it is hard to imagine that we can capture all of the important dynamics of the 2016 presidential contest with a county-level model. Our placebo test provides leverage over this problem.

Our regression models of vote share and turnout differences are grounded in the maintained hypothesis that the 2012 General Election was not affected by extensive and systematic voter fraud. This is consistent with literature already cited, none of which identifies fraud as a major problem in American presidential contests. Our use of differences also implies that we are not explicitly interested in understanding, say, where Clinton received more or fewer votes in 2016. This is an important matter for scholars of American electoral politics, but it is not our focus. Rather, we want to know where Clinton received more or fewer votes than one might have otherwise expected, based on how Obama performed in 2012, and whether these so-called extra votes were cast in locations with many non-citizens.

In terms of independent variables that ostensibly explain county-level vote share and turnout differences, our regressions contain control measures that draw on existing literature on American presidential elections. These variable touch on the role of the economy and retrospective evaluations in presidential voting (e.g. Bartels and Zaller, 2001; Fair, 2002; Cho and Gimpel 2009), the role of race (e.g., Tate, 1991; Abrajano and Alvarez

2010; Stout, 2015), and moral issues, which can be closely tied to religion (e.g., Hillygus and Shields 2005). We include as well in our regressions a measure of foreign born citizens insofar as immigration was a prominent feature of the 2016 presidential campaign. Finally, our regression models include state fixed effects, which are intended to proxy for across-state variability in areas like election administration and generic partisanship. To the extent that United State Senate races affected turnout and vote choices in the 2016 presidential race, our state fixed effects should pick these up.

Beyond these control variables, our three regressions include the fraction of a county that is composed of non-citizens. This is the key variable in our study of non-citizen voting, and the tests that follow below turn on whether various non-citizen coefficient estimates are different than zero. That is to say, we want to know if the presence of non-citizens in counties is associated with unusual election vote share or turnout differences, even in the presence of variables that are routinely used to study aggregate vote choice in American presidential elections.

Our regression models have differences on their left hand sides (e.g., Clinton vote share from 2016 minus Obama vote share from 2012) yet include variables which purport to explain presidential vote share. Our logic here is as follows. To the extent that economic conditions are correlated with presidential vote shares, such conditions will also explain differences in candidates. Donald Trump's populist economic message in 2016 was not identical to Mitt Romney's in 2012, this despite the fact that both Trump and Romney are Republicans. When a county-level economic variable is correlated with Clinton-Obama vote share differences, then, it thus likely follows that this variable reflects the extent to which Trump's and Romney's economic messages (and, implicitly, Clinton's and Obama's messages) resonated with different slices of the American electorate.

3.12. County changes between 2012 and 2016

To fix intuition, Fig. 1 displays raw differences between Clinton's 2016 vote share and Obama's 2012 vote share. In the pictured map, darker (lighter) counties are those where Clinton lost (gained) vote share relative to Obama in 2012.

Fig. 1 shows that Trump was very successful in the upper Midwest, where Democrats lost significant support in 2016: Minnesota is quite dark, for example, as are most of Wisconsin and most of Iowa. In addition, there is a band of Trump support (that is, anti-Clinton support) in New England that starts in Maine and heads southwest, maintaining some distance from the east coast of the United States. Moreover, Clinton did poorly compared to Obama in parts of the West, notably in Nevada but not in Utah, where it appears Romney (as opposed to Obama) had particular support from the state's large Mormon community.

Perhaps the most notable pattern displayed by the map in Fig. 1 is the difference between urban and rural locations, the former of which saw gains in Democratic support. In the Midwest, for example, Chicago is lightly shaded, as are Detroit, Milwaukee, and Minneapolis-St. Paul. In contrast, less-urban counties in the periphery shifted in a pro-Republican, anti-Clinton direction. While Fig. 1) seems to suggest that Trump managed to gain an advantage in 2016 by securing the votes of the electorate living outside of major city centers, this sort of a map tends to over-represent conditions in non-urban counties, which are geographically expansive and hence relatively visible but at the same time lightly populated.

Fig. 2 contains a map of the total number of votes received by Clinton minus the number of votes received by Obama, normalized

by county citizen voting age population. The figure shows that Clinton-Obama turnout differences varied in similar locations as the previously shown Clinton-Obama vote share differences. This is particularly true in regions of the United States with large Mormon, immigrant, and minority populations, for example, in Utah, California, Texas, and Chicago. Fig. 2 suggests that voters in 2016 were mobilized, as one might expect, at different levels by county.

3.13. Regression results

Table 1 contains results of estimating three regressions involving vote share and turnout differences. Our regressions are estimated with least squares and are weighted by the total two-party vote in 2016 (difference in vote share regression) and the total number of Clinton votes in 2016 (the two turnout regressions).

Before turning to the non-citizen variable in our regression models, we summarize Table 1's control variable results. The Clinton-Obama vote share of the table column shows that, *ceteris paribus*, counties with disproportionately high unemployment, low income, many men, many uneducated whites, fewer Mormons, fewer Jews, and fewer Muslims had less support for Clinton in 2016 than they did for Obama in 2012 (that is, more support for Trump in 2016 than they did for Romney in 2012). The Clinton-Obama turnout column in Table 1 is roughly similar. And, the Trump-Romney turnout column implies that, in those counties where Trump under-performed Romney, voters moved to Clinton and not to third party candidates. It is also the case that, *ceteris paribus*, counties with high unemployment rates, large groups of unemployed white males and large Hispanic populations showed greater support for Trump than Romney.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the final thing I will say before I yield to my colleague here is that not too long ago former Governor RICK SCOTT claimed erroneously that there were hundreds of thousands of undocumented immigrants registered to vote in Florida. He launched this massive investigation and spent all kinds of money investigating it. It was essentially a witch hunt.

I would ask my colleagues if they know how many people were prosecuted in that or convicted of any crime. One person was prosecuted.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. OLSZEWSKI).

□ 1140

Mr. OLSZEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. It is a solution in search of a problem, as the gentleman from Massachusetts just pointed out.

My colleague pointed out earlier some polling numbers. Let me put another polling number out there. Mr. Speaker, 90 percent of Americans support universal background checks. If that is the standard, let's pass a universal background check right now. Let's save lives from senseless gun violence.

Republicans say that this bill will stop noncitizens from voting, but as the ranking member from the Rules

Committee pointed out, nonpartisan studies have found that over 24 years and out of hundreds of millions of votes cast, there has been proof of this happening exactly 77 times.

To be clear, voter fraud should be punished to the fullest extent of the law. We welcome conversations to do that, but that is not what this bill does.

Indeed, if my colleagues were serious about election integrity, we would include protections for American voters who are overseas, like the brave men and women of our military. We would provide free automatic IDs. We would allow same-day voter registration for eligible voters, and we wouldn't force married women to navigate even more bureaucratic obstacles. We wouldn't force States to turn over their voter rolls, and wouldn't actively discourage voting by mail.

Mr. Speaker, I have a different challenge for my colleagues from the Republican side. They should join me in focusing on what Americans actually need: relief from the crushing cost of living crisis in this country. Let's stop pretending that this bill defends democracy and start helping the people we represent.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule and on this bill.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that this administration is relieving the devastating costs on the American people by creating economic growth and undoing a lot of the damage of the previous administration. We are seeing that on a daily basis.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is simply incorrect with respect to the amount of evidence that has mounted over people who are voting and should not be. The record is replete. In one example, ICE arrested criminal illegal alien Ian Andre Roberts, who was serving as the Des Moines, Iowa, school district superintendent at the time of his arrest. After his arrest, it was found that Roberts was a registered voter in Maryland despite his illegal immigration status and long criminal record. It was a criminal record filled with narcotics trafficking, driving vehicles he shouldn't have been driving, unauthorized possession of a firearm, and other crimes.

Yet we act like this isn't occurring. I have dozens of other examples right here of arrests that have been occurring this year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JACK).

Mr. JACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my support for this rule and to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY). There is no greater advocate for law and order and election integrity than Mr. ROY, and the incredible people of Texas are well-served by his leadership and stewardship of our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, the rule before us enables us to debate and vote on one of

the most consequential pieces of legislation concerning election integrity in our country's history. S. 1383, the SAVE America Act, will require voters to present photo identification to vote in Federal elections and to provide proof of U.S. citizenship when registering to vote.

Public opinion overwhelmingly supports this legislation, and it is our duty to adhere to the will of the people by swiftly passing this bill and sending the SAVE America Act to President Trump's desk for signature.

Mr. Speaker, you know me to be a data-oriented individual, so let us review the numbers before us as we debate this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, 83 percent of Americans favor requiring a government-issued photo ID in order to cast a ballot. By party, 95 percent of Republicans favor requiring photo ID to vote, and 71 percent of Democrats, the party across the aisle, favor requiring photo ID to vote. Hardly anyone, except, apparently, my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, opposes photo ID requirements before the ballot box.

Another national survey confirms the very same truth that 84 percent of Americans want mandatory voter identification in Federal elections. This includes 98 percent of Republicans who want voter ID requirements along with 67 percent of Democrats. Most importantly, 83 percent of Americans want proof of citizenship when registering to vote for the first time in our country.

Mr. Speaker, the Framers of our Constitution intended for this House of Representatives to be the most accountable to the will of the people, and the will of the people is clear. We must pass this bill today and enact the SAVE America Act.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) read a list, and I asked him to yield to me, but he didn't want to. What the gentleman was doing was cherry-picking cases basically to sow distrust in our elections, just like Donald Trump does.

If the gentleman wants to read a list, I will read a list.

Matt DePerno, a former Michigan Republican State attorney general candidate, was charged with conspiracy and undue possession of a voting machine.

Former Republican Michigan State Representative Daire Rendon was also charged with conspiracy to commit undue possession of a voting machine and false pretenses. What was Ms. Rendon's punishment for this? The Republican Party promoted her to be the chairwoman of the party in her congressional district.

A Republican county clerk in Colorado, Tina Peters, is in prison for a scheme to breach voting systems, fueled by 2020 election conspiracy theories.

A Republican official in Georgia was fined for illegally voting multiple times.

A former GOP lawmaker in Arizona pled guilty to attempted election fraud involving forged signatures.

In North Carolina, four people pled guilty on Monday to misdemeanors for their roles in absentee ballot fraud in rural North Carolina during the 2016 and 2018 elections to help Republican congressional candidates.

Let's not even get into Donald Trump actually being recorded—it is recorded—asking for 11,800 votes to basically change the results in Georgia during the 2020 election.

If my Republican friends want to talk about voter fraud, look in the mirror. Look in the mirror and maybe remember that old saying: "Physician, heal thyself."

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON).

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the SAVE America Act makes it harder for Americans to vote. As a member of the Subcommittee on Elections, my responsibility is to protect access at the ballot box, not to restrict it.

That is why I offered several comments and amendments to preserve online voter registration, ensure due process when an eligible citizen is denied the right to vote, mandate that citizenship only needs to be proven once, and allow the use of an expired passport to register to vote.

My amendments sought to limit the harm that this bill would cause and ensure that every citizen had accessible and secure ways to register and cast a ballot. This seems normal to me. This isn't about ID. This is about access. This is about procedures that will minimize the inconvenience to the United States citizens to cast their ballots.

Despite these facts, Republicans on the Rules Committee unanimously blocked these amendments from even being considered. That tells you everything you need to know. This isn't about making it easier for Americans to vote. It isn't about so-called election integrity. It is about tilting the playing field.

Republicans are losing support because voters aren't buying their ideas. Instead of changing their policies, they are trying to silence the American people at the ballot box. It is not working for their rigged, gerrymandered districts. It is not working for this effort to try to preclude people from registering to vote.

If Republicans really cared about people registering to vote, they would have online voter registration. The majority would make it to where people didn't have to go to one registrar's office in the middle of a county only during working hours when they are working their own shifts and they are not able to get there. How are people expected to register to vote under these rules?

If my Republican colleagues really cared, they would open it up. They would make online registration the rule and the law of the land.

It is shameful. It is undemocratic. I urge my colleagues in this Chamber to vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I note that a couple of things that are important for the American people to see is that this administration has driven unemployment down to historic lows. Economic growth is now back up to close to 4 percent, we believe, in the fourth quarter, and we get those numbers at the end of February.

We are seeing, importantly, a massive surge in employment among American citizens. That is among native-born American citizens. The fact is that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't care about that. They don't want to ensure that we are protecting American citizens. They don't want to have voter identification, and they don't want to ensure that only citizens vote in American elections.

That is what this is about. It is pretty simple.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE).

□ 1150

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time on this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the SAVE America Act. I am proud to cosponsor this bill.

Our democratic process depends on free, fair, and secure elections. When Americans cast their ballots, they have to have full confidence that their voice carries equal weight and that our elections are protected from abuse. Yet, in recent years, alarming loopholes that allow voting without proper identification, lengthy time to vote before elections, or time to register when you show up to vote have weakened the confidence in elections in States like mine, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and undermined a core principle of our democracy.

The right to vote is one of the most important privileges of American citizenship. That privilege must be safeguarded. Allowing individuals to vote without verifying their identity diminishes the voices of lawful voters and opens the door to illegal immigrants influencing our elections. That is unacceptable.

Illegal immigrants are here in this country. They came in by over the millions in the last 4 years. They are in California being given driver's licenses and then using those licenses to register to vote. It is happening all across the country. It is happening in States like Massachusetts.

I have an article from the Boston Herald, from February 8, 2026, titled: "Massachusetts jury convicts illegal immigrant of identity theft, stealing benefits, voter fraud."

This is an example of the type of voter fraud that is going on right here in our backyard and right in the backyard of the gentleman from Massachu-

setts. I would argue that this legislation is even more necessary now than ever.

When you had a Colombian woman unlawfully residing in Boston who was convicted 2 days ago, following a 5-day jury trial in Federal court, of identity theft offenses, including receiving rental assistance, Social Security, and SNAP benefits, as well as voter fraud under stolen identity, voting in several Federal elections, including the 2024 Presidential election, this is a real problem in Massachusetts right now. I would argue that we need to pass this legislation to actually take action.

The time for delay is over. I hope we can pass this today. I hope the Senate will take it up immediately to protect the integrity of our elections and preserve confidence in our democratic processes for generations to come.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the article referred to by the gentleman from Virginia be included in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

[From the Boston Herald]

MASSACHUSETTS JURY CONVICTS ILLEGAL IMMIGRANT OF IDENTITY THEFT, STEALING BENEFITS, VOTER FRAUD

A federal jury in Massachusetts has convicted a Colombian woman of living illegally in Boston under a stolen identity for more than 20 years and receiving over \$400,000 in stolen benefits.

Lina Maria Orovio-Hernandez, 59, who has remained in federal custody since her initial indictment last February, has also been convicted of using the stolen identity to vote in the 2024 presidential election.

Authorities say the woman obtained a Massachusetts Real ID and eight other state IDs through the stolen identity, which she also used to apply for a U.S. passport.

Massachusetts U.S. Attorney Leah Foley describes the crimes as a "slap in the face to all those who come into this country legally and abide by our laws."

"Ms. Orovio-Hernandez has lived in this country illegally for two decades, during which time she repeatedly made false statements, stole, committed fraud and even voted illegally," Foley said in a statement on Friday. "The air of entitlement is astounding. This case is yet another example of our commitment to rooting out those who violate our immigration laws and steal from United States Citizens."

Orovio-Hernandez used the stolen identity to submit a fraudulent voter registration form in January 2023 and then cast a fraudulent ballot in the 2024 presidential election.

The Colombian national also received more than \$400,000 in federal benefits: \$259,589 in Section 8 rental assistance benefits from October 2011 through January 2025; \$101,257 in Social Security disability benefits from July 2014 through January 2025; and \$43,348 in Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits from April 2005 through January 2025.

After a five-day trial in federal court in Boston, a jury convicted Orovio-Hernandez of one count of false representation of a Social Security number; one count of making a false statement in an application for a United States passport; one count of aggravated identity theft; three counts of receiving stolen government money or property; and one count of fraudulent voting.

Shawn Rice, a federal special agent in charge with the Department of Housing and Urban Development, said Orovio-Hernandez's actions were "not a one-time mistake or accident."

"Orovio-Hernandez's calculated deception caused her to fraudulently receive over \$400,000 in federal benefits including more than \$250,000 in HUD rental assistance," Rice said in a statement. "These taxpayer funds were intended to provide housing assistance to our most at-risk populations—low-income, disabled, and elderly United States citizens."

The Department of Homeland Security used Orovio-Hernandez's case last year to advertise how it updated the so-called Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements program, meant to stop voter fraud.

"Illegal aliens have exploited outdated systems to defraud Americans & taint our elections," DHS stated in a social media post last spring, around the time of Orovio-Hernandez's indictment.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I love the fact that all these guys have are statistically insignificant anecdotes that they like to put forward here.

The gentleman from Texas talked about how wonderful the economy was. This is an article that just appeared today. The Bureau of Labor Statistics found that U.S. employers added 181,000 jobs last year, far fewer than the 1.46 million that were added in 2024.

You may be impressed by that, but I am not a cheap date when it comes to making sure people have jobs in this country.

The gentleman from Texas said that we don't want to protect elections. We do. We want to protect them from you. We want to protect them from Trump. We want to protect them from all of you who are trying to suppress the vote, who are constantly in denial over the results of our elections.

Last night, we had Republicans come before the Committee on Rules, and they couldn't even bring themselves to say who won the 2020 election. They couldn't even say that Donald Trump lost Minnesota. They are so afraid of being punished by this administration. It is pathetic.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. MCCLELLAN).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, voting rights are sacred. Many members of my family fought tooth and nail to be able to exercise that sacred right.

History may not repeat itself, but it sure does rhyme.

My great-grandfather, at the turn of the 19th century, in the name of making sure that citizens voted and election integrity, had to take a literacy test and find three White men to vouch for his character. He got all the questions right. Because his name was on a list of people that the State of Alabama didn't want to register to vote,

the registrar said: "I need more questions because this nigger got them all right." He got all of them right, and he registered to vote. Yet, my father and my grandfather had to pay poll taxes to be able to vote in Tennessee.

All of this was done to make sure that local election officials could deny people they didn't want to vote the ability to vote. I took my oath of office on the Bible where my father kept his poll tax receipt, which is behind me. He kept it in there because it was a sacred right.

I swore to uphold, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, all of it. That includes the 24th Amendment, which banned poll taxes.

Yet, the SAVE America Act is a modern-day poll tax because every ID that you would have to use to register and to vote, with maybe one exception, costs money. The one that is free is a military ID.

For our military who are overseas or not able to get home to register in person, it is an added burden. For rural communities, it is an added burden. For people of color, it is an added burden. For the 21 million American citizens who don't have ready access to these documents, it is a burden.

The right to vote is sacred, and I will fight any effort to put more barriers in citizens' way to exercise it, and that is exactly what the SAVE America Act does. That is why I will oppose it.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 12½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from South Carolina (Mrs. BIGGS), my good friend.

Mrs. BIGGS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY), my friend and colleague, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule. The American people deserve elections that they can trust, and this rule moves us just one step closer to restoring that trust.

It is simple. Only American citizens should be voting in American elections. I can't believe we are even having to say that.

Right now, our system has real gaps, and the longer we ignore them, the more confidence we lose. Some of the left would rather keep those loopholes wide open than ensure the integrity of our elections.

We have already seen what happens when Washington refuses to act. We have seen the chaos at the border. We cannot let that chaos spill over into the ballot box. The SAVE America Act helps prevent that.

This bill delivers on one of President Trump's top priorities, and that is to secure our elections and to make sure only citizens vote. That is not controversial. That is the standard voters are demanding.

Let's do what is right. Let's pass this rule and move the bill forward.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I disagree very strongly with what was just said. I don't see Trump trying to preserve our elections. I have been witnessing him trying to undermine trust in our elections and to rig our elections.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us is a prime example of how awful the process has been under this Republican majority. The SAVE America Act was introduced by the gentleman of Texas just 12 days ago, and it included significant changes from its original version, the SAVE Act.

After the SAVE America Act's initial introduction, the Committee on Rules posted a complete rewrite of it last Friday. Even after two sweeping rounds of edits, Republicans were not done changing their half-baked bill. Yesterday, they posted a manager's amendment, which makes more changes, including changing when the bill would take effect and which voter IDs would be acceptable. We have seen three totally different versions of this bill in a dozen days.

It is important to say that all of these changes were backroom deals. There were no hearings, no markups, no regular order. The chairman of the Committee on House Administration didn't even feign a desire to include rank-and-file members in the process. He actually requested a completely closed rule for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, bad process is not a rare occurrence around here. It is a fundamental feature of Republican governance. Last Congress, Republican leadership made history for running the most closed, unproductive, dysfunctional Congress in modern American history. This Congress, Republicans have only doubled down on this shameful record.

Eighty-four percent of measures that Republicans have sent to the House floor have been totally closed, no amendments, no discussion, no democracy, just take it or leave it. Republican leadership has blocked 82 percent of amendments submitted to the Committee on Rules, over 3,300 amendments blocked, including most Republican amendments, and over 60 percent of bipartisan amendments.

If you are a Democrat, forget it. I am not sure they even read what we submit.

This blockade on amendments is leading to some shameful records. For example, this Republican majority set a record for the fewest House votes cast in the first session of a 2-year Congress in over 35 years. Under Speaker JOHNSON, the Committee on Rules is where democracy goes to die.

With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, why should we trust Republicans to rewrite voting laws when they are setting records for blocking voting in the people's House? This Republican Congress is an insult to the American people and a disgrace to our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1200

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I would note that when the gentleman from Massachusetts tries to dismiss the supposed trivial or anecdotal or cherry-picked cases, there are so many that it would take me more time than I have to read through them all of prosecutions for voter fraud and individual instances of voter fraud.

We have one here of Angelica Maria Francesco in Alabama in 2024, an illegal alien charged by Federal authorities with nine criminal counts in connection with her fraudulent assumption of the identity of a U.S. citizen, including voter fraud.

We have Alford Nelson, as known as Alford Samuels, in Florida in 2024. Alford Nelson was known as Alford Samuels, among several other aliases. He was charged by the Florida Department of Law Enforcement in Broward County with two felony counts of voting as an unqualified elector. Nelson, illegal alien, unlawfully voted by mail.

I can keep on going on and on and keep going down the list. It is real. The only thing that we are putting forward is a common sense proposal to ensure that only citizens vote in American elections and that we provide voter ID at the polls.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand in support of the SAVE America Act.

Consider the simple realities of life. In this country, you are required to show an ID to drive a car, to board an airplane, or to cash a paycheck. These are routine requirements for everyday participation in our society. Yet, for the most fundamental act of a self-governing people, the right to vote, that same standard of verification is missing.

Let us be clear. Despite the rhetoric, this is not about creating hurdles at the polling place. It is about the integrity of the registration process. As Americans, our right to vote is sacred, but that right is only as strong as a system that protects it. When one single illegal vote is cast, a legal vote is diluted. When a foreign national influences an election, the voice of an American citizen is silenced. This isn't a hypothetical concern. It is a matter of protecting the value of everyone's choice.

The SAVE America Act is guided by one simple principle: Only Americans should decide American elections.

Across this country, we have seen noncitizens identified on voter rolls. This is a vulnerability we can no longer afford to ignore. By passing this act, we provide the public with the one thing our political system needs most: trust—trust that the process is secure; trust that the rules are followed; and trust that every legal vote counts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me. Let us unify around the democratic principles that built this Republic. Let us pass the SAVE America Act

to keep our elections exclusively in the hands of the American people.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Texas I appreciate him reading that list, but the reason we know about that is because those people were caught. The list I read of Republican officials who were caught engaging in voter fraud, the reason we know about it because they were caught. The system is working. Stop trying to sow division and chaos into our electoral system.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER), my friend.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I point out that in 2005, 18 of the 21 members of a bipartisan Federal commission headed by former President Jimmy Carter and former Secretary of State James Baker came out in support of photo ID requirements more stringent than what Indiana had at that time. "Voters in nearly 100 democracies use a photo identification card without fear of infringement on their rights," the commission stated.

In regard to voter registration fraud, just last year, six people were indicted for fraudulent voter registration forms submitted ahead of last year's Presidential election.

The allegations of fraud appeared to be motivated by the defendants' desire to make money and to keep their jobs and was not an effort to influence the election, so said the Pennsylvania Attorney General Dave Sunday. It really doesn't matter what the motivation is. What matters is the result—fraudulent voter registrations.

Back in 2008, there was an organization called ACORN. There was an ACORN whistleblower who worked for both it and its Project Vote registration affiliate from 2005 until 2006. She said: It is ludicrous to say that fake registrations can't become fraudulent voters. She said: I assure you if you can get them on the rolls, you can get them to vote, especially using absentee ballots.

There were documents that were provided by the whistleblower that indicated that the goal of ACORN's New Mexico affiliate was that only 40 percent of its submitted registrations had to be valid.

I think fraudulent voter registration is a problem. I think requiring a valid photo ID, as President Jimmy Carter and former Secretary of State Jim Baker said, is totally a way to ensure integrity in our elections and is not a burden on the people.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Alabama, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Texas who wrote this bill: How the hell are States supposed to implement this new bill in a matter a few weeks? His original bill gave States

until 2027. We have primaries coming up in a matter of a couple of weeks. How the hell is this going to be implemented, Mr. Speaker? This is ridiculous. This is about sowing division and chaos in our elections. The bottom line is it is a rotten thing to do.

People want to participate in our democracy. They want to vote. I am going to tell you, I can't wait until the next election because they are going to vote you guys right out of office. The economy stinks under this administration. I mean, the rhetoric coming out of this White House is appalling. Enough.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle made a number of claims about this legislation. With respect to the gentleman's question, I would tell you that what we are talking about with respect to voter identification is simply a presentation of voter identification.

Thirty-six States already have voter identification requirements. To the extent that we are able to get this passed, as I hope we will and signed into law in the next month or two, we will have the ability that States can immediately be able to implement voter identification, present true voter ID. That is it, present it.

With respect to the other claims, claims about the implications for married women, the fact is that the SAVE America Act does not, as is alleged, disenfranchise voters but, rather, it provides a very specific process for anyone who changes his or her name to register to vote, including by signing an affidavit.

We believe the original form of the SAVE Act would have provided ample ability for States to have taken care of it, but we went ahead and added an additional provision to ensure that the affidavit process was there for the small fraction of the population it might have impacted. We wanted to ensure there was no chance of issues.

Questions were raised about our uniformed personnel, our men and women who serve this country overseas. We believe our previous version would have made it fine for them to be able to do what they needed to do to register to vote and vote, but we made a clarification to ensure that UOCAVA governs what happens with our men and women in uniform. We have made every attempt to work to ensure that this bill is doing exactly what it is intended to do, which is ensure that only citizens vote and that we present voter ID at the polls.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia, (Mr. PALMER).

□ 1210

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my good friend from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the question I wanted to ask to my Democratic colleagues is

that since they have made it abundantly clear that Democrats strongly oppose photo identification in order to vote, now that is a First Amendment right, so am I correct in assuming that Democrats also strongly oppose a government-issued photo ID to exercise a person's Second Amendment right? So, therefore, no ID required to buy a firearm.

If they are going to be against voter ID to exercise a First Amendment right, then I would assume also that they would be against photo ID to exercise a Second Amendment right.

I have not seen any legislation from my Democrat colleagues to do that, so I really don't believe that. I think it is all a hoax.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to respond to the gentleman who characterized January 6 as a normal day of tourism here.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to offer, as I have done already, a number of examples, numerous other examples, of individuals committing fraud.

Laura Janeth Garza in Texas, a Mexican citizen, pled guilty to two felony charges of voter impersonation and ineligible voting. Garza stole the identity of her cousin, a U.S. citizen.

Another example is that of Mario Obdulio Orellana in Texas, a 57-year-old El Salvadoran national, who was indicted by the Department of Justice on Federal immigration and voter fraud violations.

Now, I could go down and give more and more examples. The fact is, yes, these are good examples in which we have been able to intervene and stop this voter fraud and identify the individuals and prosecute those individuals.

However, we know that there is significant additional fraud going on that we are not capturing and that we are not catching. There is a very simple and basic premise of those who have been in a prosecutorial function, which is that you only catch so many people. In this case, we have been going after some individuals, but we can certainly prevent any further abuse of our voter elections. Making sure that we have integrity in those elections is to make sure we have voter identification and ensure that only citizens are voting.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for pointing out these anecdotal cases of voter fraud, and I appreciate the fact that he mentioned they were all caught, just like all the Republican officials that I read, and I have a volume more that I could read. They were caught, so it sounds like the system works.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close if the gentleman from Massachusetts is prepared to close.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, let me state, again, for the gentleman from Texas, because he doesn't seem to understand me: Nobody should vote illegally.

If this is the rampant problem they say it is, then maybe he should call Pam Bondi and ask her why she has only secured one or two voter fraud convictions nationwide out of over 155 million votes cast in 2024.

Maybe he should explain to us why his solution to a small handful of voter fraud cases is to punish the 155 million American citizens who did vote by making it harder for them to vote the next time.

Again, Republicans keep insisting there is this massive voter fraud conspiracy. The onus is on them to prove their absurd claim. Every time they try, every time this is investigated by States, by commissions, and by prosecutors, the result is the same: no widespread voter fraud conspiracy. There have been billions of votes cast over decades and a teeny tiny percentage of fraud. That is not a crisis, and it certainly is not a justification to rewrite the rules of democracy. But that is what is happening with the Republican lies to erode the trust in our democracy. That is why this bill is so toxic.

Again, the SAVE America Act tells millions of Americans: You have to show up in person and jump through hoops just to register to vote. Mr. Speaker, you can file your taxes online, you can pay your bills online, and you can get your medical results online, but if this bill passes, you can't fully register to vote online. That is nuts.

You have to buy a passport, Mr. Speaker—that is \$130—or you have to buy a copy of your birth certificate. Good luck, because you might even have to pick that up in person. What if a person lives in a rural community and has to drive 100 miles round trip just to get to the clerk's office?

What if they can't afford to take the day off from work just to register to vote?

Who gets punished?

They are students, seniors, Americans with disabilities, and working parents who just can't leave a shift early to stand in line at a clerk's office window that closes at 5:00.

We know this isn't really about voter fraud. It is not about protecting our elections. This is a smokescreen. It is a distraction. If Republicans wanted to protect elections, they would be focused on real threats: cyberattacks,

foreign interference, disinformation, intimidation, and violence against election workers. That is where the real danger is. Yet this bill does nothing to address those things.

The SAVE America Act is about denying elections and sowing distress in our system. That is because, according to Donald Trump, it is only fair and square when he wins. When Democrats win, then it is fraud. That is their whole argument in a nutshell.

The most ironic thing of all is that Republican leaders are the ones who seem to commit voter fraud the most. A Republican county clerk in Colorado is in prison for a scheme to breach voting systems fueled by 2020 election conspiracy theories. A Republican official in Georgia was fined for illegally voting multiple times. There was a former GOP lawmaker in Arizona.

Mr. Speaker, this isn't about voter suppression. This is a lousy bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts said that we are just doing this legislation because we are afraid of losing this election.

The fact of the matter is we are not. We want to ensure that we win this election by getting the votes of American citizens and not noncitizens. It is pretty simple.

I would note that the gentleman dismisses as trivial, or as the process working, the examples that we have given in the RECORD of the countless times where individuals have engaged in voter fraud and they have been caught and prosecuted. I would also like to point out that they were caught after they voted. That is the problem.

The core issue here is a very simple one. We all agree Americans overwhelmingly believe by polls and by all indication that only American citizens should vote in American elections. We currently have a problem. We even have problems where noncitizens sometimes don't know they are doing something wrong.

We should be very clear: When you register to vote, you are a citizen. When you show up to vote, you present voter identification. That is all that we do.

Mr. Speaker, in a few minutes, I will offer an amendment to the rule. The amendment will make a technical correction to the manager's amendment to reflect the intent.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I know mistakes happen, but just so everyone knows what is happening here:

You introduced a bill less than 2 weeks ago. Then you gutted that with a substitute amendment. Then you changed that version with a manager's amendment. Now you have to fix that amendment.

There was no hearing, no markup, and a slew of changes and fixes in a matter of days. It makes you wonder what other mistakes there are, all to make it harder for millions of people to vote.

I would just say to my colleagues: Slow down. Do this process right. You want to implement this bill in a matter of weeks when we have primary elections coming up in a matter of weeks? I mean, it should give everybody pause. This process of legislating here needs to improve.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROY

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the pending resolution with an amendment that I have placed at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the first section of the resolution, insert "(as modified by the amendment specified in section 6 of this resolution)" after "accompanying this resolution".

Add at the end the following:

"SEC. 6. The amendment referred to in the first section of this resolution is as follows: 'Strike the instruction to page 31, line 4, and insert the following:

"Page 31, line 3, strike 'apply with respect' and all that follows through page 31, line 5, and insert 'take effect on the date of the enactment of this section, and shall apply with respect to elections for Federal office held on or after such date.'"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution is amended.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1057 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

Strike the first section to follow the resolving clause, insert the following, and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly:

That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 1383) to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119-19, modified by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration or their respective designees; (2) the further amendment specified in section 2 of this resolution, if offered by Representative Morelle of New York or a des-

ignee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to commit.

SEC. 2. The amendment referred to in section 1 is as follows:

Page 1, strike line 1 and all that follows and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Restore Trust in Government Act".

SEC. 2. RESTRICTIONS ON TRADE AND OWNERSHIP OF COVERED INVESTMENTS.

(a) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for chapter 131 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

SUBCHAPTER IV. RESTRICTIONS ON TRADE AND OWNERSHIP OF COVERED INVESTMENTS

13151. Definitions.

13152. Trade and ownership of covered investments.

13153. Penalties.

(b) RESTRICTIONS.—Chapter 131 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end a new subchapter:

"SUBCHAPTER IV—RESTRICTIONS ON TRADE AND OWNERSHIP OF COVERED INVESTMENTS

"§ 13151. Definitions

"In this subchapter:

"(1) COMMODITY.—The term 'commodity'—

"(A) has the meaning given the term in section 1a of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1a); and

"(B) does not include a precious metal (as defined in section 1027.100 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations).

"(2) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—The term 'covered individual' means any of the following:

"(A) A Member of Congress, as defined in section 13101.

"(B) A dependent child (as defined in section 13101) or a spouse of a Member of Congress.

"(C) A trustee of a trust in which an individual described in subparagraph (A) or (B) has a beneficial interest in the principal or income of the trust as described in section 1403(b)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

"(D) The President, or the spouse or a dependent child (as defined in section 13101) of the President.

"(E) The Vice President, or the spouse or a dependent child (as defined in section 13101) of the Vice President.

"(3) COVERED INVESTMENT.—The term 'covered investment'—

"(A) means an investment in a security, a commodity, a future, or any comparable economic interest acquired through synthetic means, such as the use of a derivative, including an option, warrant, or other similar means; and

"(B) does not include—

"(i) a widely held investment fund described in section 13104(f)(8) that is diversified and publicly traded on a national or regional stock exchange;

"(ii) a United States Treasury bill, note, or bond;

"(iii) a State or municipal government bill, note, or bond;

"(iv) any compensation received by a spouse or a dependent child described in paragraph (2) from an employer of the spouse or dependent child;

"(v) an interest in a small business concern and, in the case of an investment in a family farm or ranch that qualifies as an interest in a small business concern, a future or com-

modity directly related to the farming activities and products of the farm or ranch;

"(vi) an interest in a limited liability company created for the sole purpose of purchasing or holding real estate that serves as the personal residences of the Member of Congress;

"(vii) any share of Settlement Common Stock issued under section 7(g)(1)(A) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1606(g)(1)(A)); or

"(viii) any share of Settlement Common Stock, as defined in section 3 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1602).

"(4) DIVERSIFIED.—The term 'diversified', with respect to an investment fund, means such fund does not have a stated policy of concentrating its investments in any industry, business, single country other than the United States, or bonds of a single State within the United States except for the State in which the Member of Congress resides.

"(5) FUTURE.—The term 'future' means a financial contract obligating the buyer to purchase an asset or the seller to sell an asset, such as a physical commodity or a financial investment, at a predetermined future date and price.

"(6) SECURITY.—The term 'security' has the meaning given the term in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)).

"(7) SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN.—The term 'small business concern' has the meaning given that term under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

"(8) SUPERVISING ETHICS OFFICE.—The term 'supervising ethics office' has the meaning given the term in section 13101.

"§ 13152. Trade and ownership of covered investments

"(a) CONDUCT DURING FEDERAL SERVICE.—Except as described in subsection (b)(1)(B) and subsections (e) through (g), no covered individual may, directly or indirectly, own or trade a covered investment.

"(b) COMPLIANCE.—

"(1) REQUIREMENT.—To comply with subsection (a)—

"(A) a covered individual may not purchase a covered investment; and

"(B) a covered individual shall divest of any covered investment by the effective date established in paragraph (2) at fair market value.

"(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The effective date is established as follows:

"(A) 180 days for an individual who is a covered individual on the date of enactment of the Restore Trust in Government Act.

"(B) 90 days within the date on which an individual becomes a covered individual if such date occurs after the date of enactment of the Restore Trust in Government Act.

"(c) CERTIFICATES OF DIVESTITURE.—

"(1) APPLICATION OF CERTIFICATE OF DIVESTITURE PROGRAM—For purposes of section 1043 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986—

"(A) this section shall be treated as a Federal conflict of interest statute;

"(B) any covered individual described in section 13151(2)(A) shall be treated as an eligible person described in section 1043(b)(1)(A) of such Code; and

"(C) any spouse or dependent child described in section 13151(2)(B) shall be treated as an eligible person described in section 1043(b)(1)(B) of such Code.

"(2) ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE OF DIVESTITURE.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Each supervising ethics office shall issue a certificate of divestiture to each covered individual required to divest under this subchapter upon submission of proof of compliance by such individual with the requirements to divest or any extensions granted by the supervising ethics office.

“(B) ELIGIBILITY.—Such certificate shall include an identification of each specific property eligible for the application of the certificate of divestiture program as determined by the supervising ethics office.

“(d) INCOME TAX.—A loss from a transaction or holding involving a covered financial instrument that is conducted in violation of this section may not be deducted from the amount of income tax owed by the covered individual.

“(e) OCCUPATIONAL EXCEPTION.—A spouse or dependent child of a covered individual as described in section 13151(2)(B) may trade any covered investment if such covered investment is not owned by a covered individual and if such trade is performed as a function of the primary occupation of the spouse or dependent child.

“(f) TRUSTS.—

“(1) QUALIFIED BLIND TRUST.—Any covered investment held in a qualified blind trust as defined in section 13104(f)(3) shall be divested in accordance with subsection (b)(1)(B) by the effective date established in subsection (b)(2).

“(2) FAMILY TRUST.—A supervising ethics office may grant an exemption for covered investments held in a family trust only if—

“(A) no covered individual—

“(i) is a grantor of the family trust;

“(ii) contributed any covered investment to the family trust; or

“(iii) has any authority over a trustee of the family trust, including the authority to appoint, replace, or direct the actions of such a trustee; and

“(B) the grantor of the family trust is or was a family member of the covered individual.

“(3) REQUESTS.—A covered individual seeking an exemption under paragraph (2) shall submit to the applicable supervising ethics office a request for the exemption, in writing, certifying that the conditions described in that paragraph are met.

“(g) ASSETS ACQUIRED IN SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES.—In the event that a covered individual acquires a covered investment after the date of enactment of the Restore Trust in Government Act other than by purchase (such as by marriage, inheritance, divorce settlement, or other circumstance), the covered individual shall have 90 days from the date on which such investment was acquired to divest such covered investment at fair market value.

“(h) EXTENSION.—A supervising ethics office may grant a covered individual an extension of time to comply with a divestment deadline under this subchapter if a covered investment cannot be divested by such deadline due to low liquidity, vesting schedules, or contractual restrictions.

“(i) INTERPRETATIVE GUIDANCE.—The supervising ethics office shall issue interpretive guidance on any relevant term not defined in this subchapter.

“13153. Penalties

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) PENALTIES.—Any covered individual who violates the restrictions on trading or ownership of covered investments in section 13152 shall, at the direction of the supervising ethics office—

“(A) pay a fee equal to ten percent of the value of the covered investment; and

“(B) disgorge the profits of any transaction that violates the provisions of this subchapter.

“(2) PAYMENT OF PENALTY TO TREASURY.—A penalty imposed under paragraph (1)(B) shall be payable into the Treasury of the United States.

“(b) PAYMENT RESTRICTIONS.—A Member of Congress may not pay any of the penalties under this section by using amounts from the following sources:

“(1) The Members’ Representational Allowance.

“(2) The Senators’ Official Personnel and Office Expense Account.

“(3) Any contribution (as defined in section 301(8) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101(8))) accepted as a candidate, and any other donation received as support for activities of the individual as a holder of Federal office.

“(c) PUBLICATION.—Each supervising ethics office shall publish on a publicly available website a description of—

“(1) each fine assessed by the supervising ethics office pursuant to this section;

“(2) the reason why each such fine was assessed; and

“(3) the result of each assessment”

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 214, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 61]

YEAS—216

Aderholt	Downing	Huizenga
Alford	Dunn (FL)	Hunt
Allen	Edwards	Hurd (CO)
Amodei (NV)	Ellzey	Issa
Arrington	Emmer	Jack
Babin	Estes	Jackson (TX)
Bacon	Evans (CO)	James
Baird	Ezell	Johnson (LA)
Balderson	Fallon	Johnson (SD)
Barr	Fedorchak	Jordan
Barrett	Feenstra	Joyce (OH)
Baumgartner	Fine	Joyce (PA)
Bean (FL)	Finstad	Kean
Begich	Fischbach	Kelly (MS)
Bentz	Fitzgerald	Kelly (PA)
Bergman	Fitzpatrick	Kennedy (UT)
Bice	Fleischmann	Kiggans (VA)
Biggs (AZ)	Flood	Kiley (CA)
Biggs (SC)	Fong	Kim
Billirakis	Poxx	Knott
Boebert	Franklin, Scott	Kustoff
Bost	Fry	LaHood
Brecheen	Fulcher	LaLota
Bresnahan	Garbarino	Langworthy
Buchanan	Gill (TX)	Latta
Burchett	Gimenez	Lawler
Burlison	Goldman (TX)	Lee (FL)
Calvert	Gonzales, Tony	Letlow
Cammack	Gooden	Loudermilk
Carey	Gosar	Lucas
Carter (GA)	Graves	Luna
Carter (TX)	Griffith	Luttrell
Ciscomani	Grothman	Mace
Cline	Guest	Mackenzie
Cloud	Guthrie	Malliotakis
Clyde	Hageman	Maloy
Cole	Hamadah (AZ)	Mann
Collins	Haridopolos	Massie
Comer	Harrigan	Mast
Crane	Harris (MD)	McCaul
Crank	Harris (NC)	McClain
Crawford	Harshbarger	McClintock
Crenshaw	Hern (OK)	McCormick
Davidson	Higgins (LA)	McDowell
De La Cruz	Hill (AR)	McGuire
DesJarlais	Hinson	Messmer
Diaz-Balart	Houchin	Meuser
Donalds	Hudson	Miller (IL)

Miller (OH)	Rose	Stutzman
Miller (WV)	Rouzer	Taylor
Miller-Meeks	Roy	Tenney
Mills	Rulli	Thompson (PA)
Moolenaar	Rutherford	Tiffany
Moore (AL)	Salazar	Timmons
Moore (NC)	Scalise	Turner (OH)
Moore (UT)	Schmidt	Valadao
Moore (WV)	Schweikert	Van Drew
Moran	Scott, Austin	Van Dyne
Nehls	Seif	Van Epps
Newhouse	Sessions	Van Orden
Norman	Shreve	Wagner
Nunn (IA)	Simpson	Walberg
Obernolte	Smith (MO)	Weber (TX)
Ogles	Smith (NE)	Webster (FL)
Onder	Smith (NJ)	Westerman
Owens	Smucker	Wied
Palmer	Spartz	Williams (TX)
Patronis	Staubert	Wilson (SC)
Pfluger	Stefanik	Wittman
Reschenthaler	Stell	Womack
Rogers (AL)	Steube	Yakym
Rogers (KY)	Strong	Zinke

NAYS—214

Adams	Golden (ME)	Ocasio-Cortez
Aguilar	Goldman (NY)	Olszewski
Amo	Gomez	Omar
Ansari	Gonzalez, V.	Pallone
Auchincloss	Goodlander	Panetta
Balint	Gottheimer	Pappas
Barragan	Gray	Pelosi
Beatty	Green, Al (TX)	Perez
Bell	Grijalva	Peters
Bera	Harder (CA)	Pettersen
Beyer	Hayes	Pingree
Bishop	Himes	Pocan
Bonamici	Horsford	Pou
Boyle (PA)	Houlihan	Pressley
Brown	Hoyer	Quigley
Brownley	Hoyle (OR)	Ramirez
Budzinski	Huffman	Randall
Bynum	Ivey	Raskin
Carbajal	Jackson (IL)	Riley (NY)
Carson	Jacobs	Rivas
Carter (LA)	Jayapal	Ross
Casar	Jeffries	Ruiz
Case	Johnson (GA)	Ryan
Casten	Johnson (TX)	Salinas
Castor (FL)	Kamlager-Dove	Sanchez
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Scanlon
Cherfilus-	Keating	Schakowsky
McCormick	Kelly (IL)	Schneider
Chu	Kennedy (NY)	Scholten
Cisneros	Khanna	Schrier
Clark (MA)	Krishnamoorthi	Scott (VA)
Clarke (NY)	Landsman	Scott, David
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Sewell
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Cohen	Latimer	Simon
Conaway	Lee (NV)	Smith (WA)
Correa	Lee (PA)	Sorensen
Costa	Leger Fernandez	Soto
Courtney	Levin	Stansbury
Craig	Liccardo	Stanton
Crockett	Lieu	Stevens
Crow	Lofgren	Strickland
Cuellar	Lynch	Subramanyam
Davids (KS)	Magaziner	Suozi
Davis (IL)	Mannion	Swalwell
Davis (NC)	Matsui	Sykes
Dean (PA)	McBath	Takano
DeGette	McBride	Thanedar
DeLauro	McClain Delaney	Thompson (CA)
DelBene	McClellan	Thompson (MS)
Deluzio	McCollum	Titus
DeSaulnier	McDonald Rivet	Tlaib
Dexter	McGarvey	Tokuda
Dingell	McGovern	Tonko
Doggett	McIver	Torres (CA)
Elfreth	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Escobar	Menefee	Trahan
Espallat	Menendez	Tran
Evans (PA)	Meng	Underwood
Fields	Mfume	Vargas
Figures	Min	Vasquez
Fletcher	Moore (WI)	Veasey
Foster	Morelle	Velazquez
Foushee	Morrison	Vindman
Frankel, Lois	Moskowitz	Walkinshaw
Friedman	Moulton	Wasserman
Frost	Mirman	Schultz
Garamendi	Mullin	Waters
Garcia (CA)	Nadler	Watson Coleman
Garcia (IL)	Neal	Whitesides
Garcia (TX)	Neguse	Williams (GA)
Gillen	Norcross	Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—2

Murphy

Perry

□ 1253

Messrs. CARSON and SCHNEIDER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 61.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 216, noes 215, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

AYES—216

Aderholt	Fine	LaLota
Alford	Finstad	Langworthy
Allen	Fischbach	Latta
Amodi (NV)	Fitzgerald	Lawler
Arrington	Fitzpatrick	Lee (FL)
Babin	Fleischmann	Letlow
Bacon	Flood	Loudermilk
Baird	Fong	Lucas
Balderson	Fox	Luna
Barr	Franklin, Scott	Luttrell
Barrett	Fry	Mace
Baumgartner	Fulcher	Mackenzie
Bean (FL)	Garbarino	Malliotakis
Begich	Gill (TX)	Maloy
Bentz	Jimenez	Mann
Bergman	Goldman (TX)	Mast
Bice	Gonzales, Tony	McCaul
Biggs (AZ)	Gooden	McClain
Biggs (SC)	Gosar	McClintock
Bilirakis	Graves	McCormick
Boebert	Griffith	McDowell
Bost	Grothman	McGuire
Brecheen	Guest	Messmer
Bresnahan	Guthrie	Meuser
Buchanan	Hageman	Miller (IL)
Burchett	Hamadeh (AZ)	Miller (OH)
Burlison	Haridopolos	Miller (WV)
Calvert	Harrigan	Miller-Meeks
Cammack	Harris (MD)	Mills
Carey	Harris (NC)	Moolenaar
Carter (GA)	Harshbarger	Moore (AL)
Carter (TX)	Hern (OK)	Moore (NC)
Ciscomani	Higgins (LA)	Moore (UT)
Cline	Hill (AR)	Moore (WV)
Cloud	Hinson	Moran
Clyde	Houchin	Nehls
Cole	Hudson	Newhouse
Collins	Huizenga	Norman
Comer	Hunt	Nunn (IA)
Crane	Hurd (CO)	Oberholte
Crank	Issa	Ogles
Crawford	Jack	Onder
Crenshaw	Jackson (TX)	Owens
Davidson	James	Palmer
De La Cruz	Johnson (LA)	Patronis
DesJarlais	Johnson (SD)	Perry
Diaz-Balart	Jordan	Pfluger
Donalds	Joyce (OH)	Reschenthaler
Downing	Joyce (PA)	Rogers (AL)
Dunn (FL)	Kean	Rogers (KY)
Edwards	Kelly (MS)	Rose
Ellzey	Kelly (PA)	Rouzer
Emmer	Kennedy (UT)	Roy
Estes	Kiggans (VA)	Rulli
Evans (CO)	Kiley (CA)	Rutherford
Ezell	Kim	Salazar
Fallon	Knott	Scalise
Fedorchak	Kustoff	Schmidt
Feenstra	LaHood	Schweikert

Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Shreve
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil

Steube
Strong
Stutzman
Taylor
Tenny
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner (OH)
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dуйne
Van Epps

Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

□ 1302

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS ACCESSIBILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT OF 2025

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1057, I call up the bill (S. 1383) to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas). Pursuant to House Resolution 1057, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119–19, modified by the amendment printed in House Report 119–493 (modified by the amendment specified in section 6 of H. Res. 1057), is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

S. 1383

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act” or the “SAVE America Act”.

SEC. 2. ENSURING ONLY CITIZENS ARE REGISTERED TO VOTE IN ELECTIONS FOR FEDERAL OFFICE.

(a) DEFINITION OF DOCUMENTARY PROOF OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP.—Section 3 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20502) is amended—

(1) by striking “As used” and inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—As used”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) DOCUMENTARY PROOF OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP.—As used in this Act, the term ‘documentary proof of United States citizenship’ means, with respect to an applicant for voter registration, any of the following:

“(1) A form of identification issued consistent with the requirements of the REAL ID Act of 2005 that indicates the applicant is a citizen of the United States.

“(2) A valid United States passport.

“(3) The applicant’s official United States military identification card, together with a United States military record of service showing that the applicant’s place of birth was in the United States.

“(4) A valid government-issued photo identification card issued by a Federal, State or Tribal government showing that the applicant’s place of birth was in the United States.

“(5) A valid government-issued photo identification card issued by a Federal, State or Tribal government other than an identification described in paragraphs (1) through (4), but only if presented together with one or more of the following:

“(A) A certified birth certificate issued by a State, a unit of local government in a State, or a Tribal government which—

“(i) was issued by the State, unit of local government, or Tribal government in which the applicant was born;

“(ii) was filed with the office responsible for keeping vital records in the State;

“(iii) includes the full name, date of birth, and place of birth of the applicant;

NOES—215

Adams
Aguilar
Amo
Ansari
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragan
Beatty
Bell
Bera
Beyer
Bishop
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bynum
Carbajal
Carson
Carter (LA)
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Flood
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conaway
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuevas
Dauels (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dexter
Dingell
Doggett
Elfreth
Escobar
Espaillat
Evans (PA)
Fields
Figures
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Friedman
Frost
Garamendi
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gillen
Golden (ME)

Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez, V.
Goodlander
Gottheimer
Gray
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy (NY)
Khanna
Krishnamoorthi
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Mannion
Massie
Matsui
McBath
McBride
McClain Delaney
McClellan
McCollum
McDonald Rivet
McGarvey
McGovern
McIver
Meeks
Menefee
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Min
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Morrison
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez

Olszewski
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Gray
Pelosi
Perez
Peters
Petterson
Pingree
Pocan
Pou
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Randall
Raskin
Riley (NY)
Rivas
Ross
Ruiz
Ryan
Salinas
Sanchez
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Simon
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Subramanyam
Suozzi
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Tran
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velazquez
Vindman
Walkinshaw
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Whitesides
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—1

Murphy

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.