

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### DEPORTING FRAUDSTERS ACT OF 2026

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, Pursuant to House Resolution 1115, I call up the bill (H.R. 1958) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify that aliens who have been convicted of defrauding the United States Government or the unlawful receipt of public benefits are inadmissible and deportable, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

H.R. 1958

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 "Deporting Fraudsters Act of 2026".

#### SEC. 2. INADMISSIBILITY AND DEPORTABILITY RELATED TO DEFAUDING THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT OR THE UNLAWFUL RECEIPT OF PUBLIC BENEFITS.

(a) INADMISSIBILITY.—Section 212(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(J) DEFAUDING THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT OR THE UNLAWFUL RECEIPT OF PUBLIC BENEFITS.—Any alien who has been convicted of, who admits having committed, or who admits committing acts which constitute the essential elements of—

"(i) an offense described in section 15 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2024) (relating to violations of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program benefits);

"(ii) an offense described in section 208 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 408) (relating to fraud involving social security account numbers or social security cards);

"(iii) an offense described in section 666 of title 18, United States Code (relating to theft or bribery concerning programs receiving Federal funds);

"(iv) an offense described in section 1028 of title 18, United States Code (relating to fraud and related activity in connection with identification documents, authentication features, and information);

"(v) an offense described in section 1031 of title 18, United States Code (relating to major fraud against the United States);

"(vi) an offense described under chapter 63 of title 18, United States Code (relating to mail fraud and other fraud offenses);

"(vii) an offense described in section 371 of title 18, United States Code (relating to conspiracy to commit offense or to defraud United States);

"(viii) any other offense that involves defrauding the United States Government or the unlawful receipt of a Federal public benefit (as such term is defined in section 401(c) of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1611) or a State or local public benefit (as such term is defined in section 411(c) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1621)); or

"(ix) a conspiracy to commit an offense described in clause (i) through (viii), is inadmissible."

(b) DEPORTABILITY.—Section 237(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C.

1227(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(G) DEFAUDING THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT OR THE UNLAWFUL RECEIPT OF PUBLIC BENEFITS.—Any alien who has been convicted of, who admits having committed, or who admits committing acts which constitute the essential elements of—

"(i) an offense described in section 15 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2024) (relating to violations of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program benefits);

"(ii) an offense described in section 208 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 408) (relating to fraud involving social security account numbers or social security cards);

"(iii) an offense described in section 666 of title 18, United States Code (relating to theft or bribery concerning programs receiving Federal funds);

"(iv) an offense described in section 1028 of title 18, United States Code (relating to fraud and related activity in connection with identification documents, authentication features, and information);

"(v) an offense described in section 1031 of title 18, United States Code (relating to major fraud against the United States);

"(vi) an offense described under chapter 63 of title 18, United States Code (relating to mail fraud and other fraud offenses);

"(vii) an offense described in section 371 of title 18, United States Code (relating to conspiracy to commit offense or to defraud United States);

"(viii) any other offense that involves defrauding the United States Government or the unlawful receipt of a Federal public benefit (as such term is defined in section 401(c) of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1611) or a State or local public benefit (as such term is defined in section 411(c) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1621)); or

"(ix) a conspiracy to commit an offense described in clause (i) through (viii), is deportable."

(c) INELIGIBILITY FOR ANY IMMIGRATION RELIEF.—Any alien described in subparagraph (J) of section 212(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(2)(J)) or subparagraph (G) of section 237(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)(2)) shall be ineligible for any relief under the immigration laws (as such term is defined in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101)), including under section 2242 of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (112 Stat. 2681).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1115, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1958.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, for years, Republicans on the Committee on the Judiciary have sounded the alarm about the costs of the Democrats' open-border policies on our schools, hospitals, homeless shelters, food banks, law enforcement, and American wages.

What we are now discovering is that many within these populations immediately set out to rob our country of literally billions of dollars paid by American taxpayers to help needy Americans.

Worse still, evidence is now emerging from whistleblowers that this was done while Democratic officials in sanctuary jurisdictions deliberately turned a blind eye to industrial-scale larceny in exchange for political support.

We have already heard from TSA agents who watched helplessly as Somali immigrants brazenly shipped millions of dollars out of this country in their carry-on luggage while alarms to the Biden-Harris administration were simply ignored.

We have heard audio recordings of these criminals discussing with Minnesota's Democratic attorney general how they had each other's backs. We have heard whistleblowers tell us their warnings to Minnesota's Governor, resulting in retaliation against them, but no actions to stop the fraudsters.

One estimate is that the Minnesota scandal accounts for some \$9 billion of stolen funds. As investigators begin turning over rocks in other Democratic sanctuary jurisdictions, like California and New York, this may prove just the tip of an iceberg of corruption.

There is more. Although this fraud may well end up implicating thousands of illegal aliens allowed into our country and then protected from prosecution by the Democrats, Social Security fraud and other fraud offenses implicate literally millions. Yet, our ability to remove such fraudsters is hamstrung by the courts, sometimes for decades.

In one case from 2017, the Board of Immigration Appeals held that an alien was not removable from the United States for having committed an aggravated felony despite the alien's fraud conviction for \$169,000 in food stamps theft.

In another case, an alien was placed in removal proceedings in 2005 while he remained until at least 2013, when his case finally made its way to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit to determine whether his conviction for conspiracy to traffic in identification documents made him removable from the United States.

Another fraudster spent 2 years challenging his removal proceedings even though he admitted that he had received up to \$3.5 million through food stamp fraud.

Other cases with aliens convicted of wire fraud and food stamp fraud languished for 1½ years to 4 years, respectively, before a Federal court finally upheld their removal orders.

In many other cases, aliens remained eligible to stay in the United States indefinitely despite their fraud convictions.

The Deporting Fraudsters Act of 2026, introduced by our colleague, DAVE TAYLOR, streamlines this removal process. The bill is simple. If you admit to or are convicted of fraudulently receiving public benefits or committing other fraud offenses, you are out of here on the next plane and can never return.

This bill also incorporates my Consequences for Social Security Fraud Act, which the House passed on a bipartisan basis 2 years ago. That bill simply says that if you are an alien who admits to or is convicted of Social Security fraud or identification document fraud, you cannot enter our country. If you are already here, you are to be deported. That is just common sense.

Even *The New York Times* reported late last year that as many as 1 million illegal aliens “are using fraudulent or stolen Social Security numbers.”

According to another report, in 2017 alone, there were 1.2 million cases in which illegal aliens used Social Security numbers that belonged to someone else or that were fabricated. That number surely has skyrocketed following 4 years of the Biden-Harris border crisis.

A 2022 investigative report found that because of this fraud, victims “may face tax bills for income they didn’t earn or depleted benefits,” and may suffer from poor credit histories or even criminal histories.

That is exactly what happened to Daniel Kluver, a Minnesota man whose identity was stolen by a Guatemalan illegal alien with a criminal history and multiple deportations. Because of the identity theft, Kluver lost thousands of dollars through garnished wages and increased taxes, and spent years unsuccessfully trying to untangle the mystery of his stolen identity.

Now, imagine if that victim is you, and the perpetrator is an illegal alien who is allowed to stay in the United States indefinitely while a dysfunctional court system takes years to decide whether or not to deport him. That is absurd.

By specifically listing Federal crimes that make an alien inadmissible to or removable from the United States, this bill closes loopholes, removes the yearslong litigation that so often bogs down the removal process, and strengthens our immigration system.

Finally, the bill guarantees that the fraudsters described in this bill cannot exploit Americans’ generosity again by receiving any immigration relief in this country.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, another week, another redundant and completely unnecessary immigration crime bill. This one purports to make the commission of certain fraud offenses into deportable offenses, but conviction of a fraud offense is already a deportable offense, as the gentleman’s recitation of all the cases involving people who were convicted of a crime and then deported and removed from the country demonstrates.

Fraud is considered a crime involving moral turpitude and a specifically enumerated aggravated felony, the conviction of either of which subjects any immigrant to deportation and removal from the country.

In the past, we have heard our colleagues claim these bills are necessary to resolve an undefined ambiguity in the law, but there is no ambiguity.

□ 1330

Section 101(a)(43) of the Immigration and Nationality Act specifies fraud as an aggravated felony, which is by definition a deportable offense. Supreme Court precedent for more than 70 years has treated fraud as a crime involving moral turpitude and therefore a deportable and removable offense.

I know that President Trump, who knows a lot about the criminal justice system, wants to strike a new pose of being tough on fraud. We still have a First Amendment, so that is his right. But at every turn, the Trump administration has dismantled the government programs and offices that actually combat fraud.

At the DOJ, they disbanded key anti-kleptocracy efforts. They eliminated the Consumer Protection Branch that prosecuted corporate fraud. They gutted core anticorruption units like the Public Integrity Section and the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act Unit. As all of America knows, they have completely ravaged and shut down the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the first and only agency devoted solely at the Federal level to protect American consumers against being cheated by scammers and fraudsters and big corporations.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau delivered \$21 billion back to more than 200 million Americans who were victims of fraud, scams, and other predatory business practices, and the administration has been gutting it because they are soft on corporate fraud and white-collar crime. That is the reality of what is going on here.

Hell-bent on meeting Stephen Miller’s arbitrary mass deportation monthly quotas, this administration has directed FBI agents to deprioritize white-collar crime and instead devote their time to the big immigration roundup, whose beautiful results we can see in the nightmare of Minneapolis, where American citizens were shot down for exercising their constitutional rights.

As a result, prosecutions of white-collar crimes, which include a variety of fraud offenses, were down more than 10 percent in the Trump administration in 2025.

If that weren’t enough, ICE is interfering with States’ abilities to successfully prosecute crimes, like fraud and theft, and to ensure that perpetrators pay their fines and make restitution to their victims. Why is that? Well, they are deporting people before they can actually be tried and fined and before the fines are paid.

Take the case of Jerson Nelon Flores. He was accused of stealing \$100 million worth of diamonds. Before his trial was set to take place, ICE swooped in and simply deported him before trial. That meant he served no jail time and was never ordered to pay any restitution to his victims, leaving them with lots of questions about where the \$100 million of diamonds are but no justice.

By bypassing the conviction requirement, this legislation would hand a literal get-out-of-jail-free card to immigrants who commit fraud by deporting them without going through the criminal justice system and giving their victims a day in court.

This is part of a broader trend of this administration siding with the perpetrators against the victims, a trend America has seen in the administration’s shameful decision to cover up for Jeffrey Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell’s co-conspirators, accomplices, and enablers, while outing the identities and even the photographs of survivors. It is a trend that includes the President’s outrageous abuse of the pardon power to let fraudsters, who also happen to be MAGA donors, to purchase a pardon and skip out on their obligation to pay any fine or restitution to their victims.

That includes Trevor Milton, who defrauded investors in his company to the tune of \$676 million. Milton and his wife donated \$1.8 million to the President’s reelection campaign. In March of last year, Milton got his pardon, and erased all of the restitution, the hundreds of millions of dollars he owed to his victims.

Take Lawrence Duran, who was sentenced to the longest prison sentence in American history for Medicare fraud in September of 2016. He filed hundreds of thousands of false claims with Medicare, bilking the taxpayers out of more than \$87 million. Then he got his Trump pardon and skipped away without having to pay any of the fines or the restitution.

If you can remember one statistic from today, in just 1 year, Donald Trump’s pardons wiped out more than \$1.3 billion in restitution and fines to victims and survivors of fraud and other scams and white-collar offenses.

This bill is simply another effort to push a fake narrative while ignoring all of the fraud that engulfs us, which the administration has tolerated or even approved through these outrageous pardons.

The administration used fraud as an excuse to send thousands of masked Federal agents to terrorize the people of Minneapolis and surrounding areas, a blunder so egregious our colleagues are told not even to use the phrase “mass deportation” anymore because the vast majority of Americans reject what they saw on the streets of Minneapolis, agents beating up peaceful protesters and killing them. American citizens are dying because they dare to exercise their First Amendment rights and their Second Amendment rights in public.

We saw the price of this authoritarianism. Every day this administration is pushing lies to try to get the American people to ignore the reality that is discernible by our own senses. That is the real fraud on the American people.

Now, they want us to believe that they are combating fraud when they pardon it, and they wipe out all of the government units that are designed to ferret out fraud. They started by firing 17 inspectors general, whose job it is to fight fraud, waste, corruption, and abuse in the Federal Government. They sacked all of them to make it possible for the kind of rampant corruption we have seen to take place. The American people can see what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to oppose this redundant, unnecessary, and distractionary bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

My friend fundamentally misunderstands the provisions of this bill. There is nothing in this bill that prevents the prosecution and punishment of an individual for fraud.

In fact, when they admit the fraud, I think that is a plea of guilty. They can still be prosecuted. They can still be incarcerated. But this assures at the end of the judicial process and at the end of their punishment, they be deported.

Remember, the Democrats’ sanctuary policies require that criminals in jail be released back onto our streets rather than be deported. That is what this bill fixes. They claim it is unnecessary because aliens with fraud convictions are already inadmissible and removable. That couldn’t be farther from the truth. Although aliens who commit some forms of fraud may be found deportable, it is far from certain.

Take, for example, a case in which an alien stole an American’s identity for 19 years. Although convicted, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled this wasn’t enough to constitute moral turpitude and therefore was not deportable.

In a Fifth Circuit case from 2021, an alien already had been in removal proceedings for 6 years before the Federal appeals court finally found that this made him deportable.

Another fraudster spent 2 years challenging his removal proceedings, even

though he had admitted that he had received some \$3.5 million through food stamp fraud.

These criminal aliens should have been out of this country once they had served their sentences, and that is why H.R. 1958 is imperative.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, nothing angers a law-abiding American more than being stolen from and then watching the system let the thief go to do it over and over again.

Our immigration system only works when people who come here follow our laws and want to build the American Dream, not strip it away from the very people who make this country work.

□ 1340

Right now that trust is broken. These are not small scams. They are organized, deliberate fraud schemes that target the most vulnerable among us: a single mother relying on food assistance or an elderly couple who spent a lifetime paying into Social Security, or a child whose identity is stolen before they can even speak.

Here is the part that makes no sense. Under current law, defrauding the U.S. or stealing taxpayer dollars is not explicitly a deportable offense. That loophole has allowed criminal fraud networks to operate for decades.

We have seen the consequences. In Minnesota, Somali fraud networks stole millions, and Federal prosecutors now estimate Medicaid fraud in that State alone could hit \$9 billion. Even in my own home State of Arizona, fraud exceeds billions of dollars.

However, Minnesota isn’t the outlier. It is the warning sign. A GAO report found nearly 3 million Social Security numbers with evidence of misuse. A Cuban national defrauded Medicare of more than \$3 million through a fake medical equipment scheme. A 3-year-old child had her Social Security number used to take out credit cards and auto loans. These are not isolated cases.

Fraudsters can exploit SNAP, Social Security, Medicare, and other programs because the law does not clearly state that these crimes make an alien removable from the U.S. Litigation delays and loopholes let these offenders stay here and continue to harm Americans while their victims struggle to recover.

The Deporting Fraudsters Act of 2026 closes that gap, and it does it with simple, commonsense steps. It makes clear that any alien who defrauds the U.S. or steals government funds intended for American citizens is inadmissible and deportable. It ensures that an alien’s own admission to committing fraud can trigger consequences because courts in multiple circuits have ruled that certain Social Security fraud offenses do not automatically carry im-

migration penalties. It bars these offenders from receiving immigration benefits, including asylum, so they cannot exploit our generosity twice.

This is not complicated. If a person comes to this country to build a life, then follow our laws and contribute. We will welcome that person. If a person comes here to steal from American taxpayers, that person doesn’t get to stay.

Becoming an American is a privilege. It carries responsibilities, and when someone abuses that privilege by stealing from the very people who welcome them, then they forfeit the right to remain here.

This act is a commonsense reform that protects vulnerable Americans. I am proud and pleased to be a cosponsor of this bill.

Now I will just touch on the Biden pardons. Literally hundreds of millions of restitution dollars forgone. In fact, one individual, Paul Daugerdas, was sentenced to 15 years in prison for his role in a multibillion-dollar tax fraud scheme described by prosecutors as one of the largest criminal tax fraud cases in U.S. history.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why do I bring that up?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEAN of Florida). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is because my friend across the aisle is obsessed with this Trump derangement syndrome that we hear about so much.

What about the 1,400 people who were pardoned in the last waning hours of the Biden administration?

Many of them were fraudsters. Hundreds of millions of dollars in restitution is forgone. I didn’t hear any outrage from the gentleman over that, but there should be outrage when an illegal alien is committing fraud. This bill will help make them inadmissible and deportable.

That is what this bill is about. It is not some imaginary or delusional socialist argument that we are hearing from the other side.

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

Mr. Speaker, they are entitled to their own opinions, but they are not entitled to their own facts. I am afraid that the gentleman owes former President Biden a major apology for what he just said.

He said that hundreds of millions of dollars in restitution owed by people whom Joe Biden pardoned was forgiven. According to a study by the Cato Institute, which the gentleman can look up, all of the fines and restitution forgiven by Joe Biden was \$680,000, not even \$1 million; whereas, Donald Trump has forgiven \$1.3 billion in fines and restitution owed by the fraudsters and common and white-collar criminals whom he has pardoned since

he got back into office under their pay-to-play pardon operation they have got going over there right now. That is the reality and the fact. That is the truth of the matter.

No, Joe Biden did not forgive hundreds of millions of dollars in fines. What Donald Trump has done is utterly aberrational in American history.

I see the gentleman is fleeing the Chamber right now rather than dealing with the facts and the reality of it.

The gentleman was completely wrong.

The gentleman was fleeing the Chamber rather than deal with the reality that he was absolutely wrong when he accused President Biden of forgiving hundreds of millions of dollars in fines and restitution to people he pardoned. It never happened.

It was less than \$1 million. It was \$680,000.

Mr. Speaker, I will submit the Cato Institute report for the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I would love to be contradicted if there are any facts over on that side of the aisle. If anybody wants to traffic in facts—but, no, maybe it is more imaginary and delusional sophistry from the gentleman.

Does he have any facts?

It is no problem just saying: I made a mistake.

It is like Secretary Noem calling Alex Pretti a domestic terrorist, calling Renee Good a domestic terrorist. That was a terrible mistake and a blunder, but she couldn't admit it.

Will the gentleman admit that he was wrong about that or does he have facts?

I don't know. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether there might be some way of determining whether there are any facts available to contradict me on this, but the study that I have shows that all of Joe Biden's pardons result in less than \$1 million in fines and restitution to be forgiven.

Mr. Speaker, do you know why that is?

It is because up until President Trump, every other President had demanded ordinarily as a matter of course that fines be paid and restitution be paid.

I hope that there are some people on the other side of the aisle—they have got a huge staff of hundreds of people, can somebody find a fact that would contradict what I have just said.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), who is the ranking member of the Subcommittee of Immigration Integrity.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1958.

This bill was inspired by the allegations of fraud in Minnesota that a conservative YouTuber claims to have discovered, and it is part and parcel of the Trump administration's deadly assault on Minnesota.

The Trump administration used these fraud allegations to surge thousands of lawless ICE and Border Patrol

agents into Minnesota who used increasingly violent tactics to terrorize communities, to kidnap people off the streets, to break into homes without a warrant, to deploy chemical weapons, and to assault anyone who dared to peacefully and lawfully protest, observe, or record their activities.

We can never forget that ICE's lawless actions resulted in the killings of two U.S. citizens. Renee Good, a mother of three, had just dropped one of her three children off at school and stopped to support her neighbors when an ICE agent shot her not once, not twice, but three times at point blank range and killed her.

Alex Pretti, an ICU nurse, tried to help a peaceful observer whom Federal agents had shoved to the ground when several agents attacked him, wrestled him to the ground, and, Mr. Speaker, shot him 10 times.

The harm that the Trump administration inflicted on Minnesota has resulted in generational trauma on people of all statuses, all in the name of so-called fraud. However, this was never about fraud. We know that because the Department of Justice under President Biden began investigating these crimes back in 2022. Likewise, the bill before us today it is not really about fraud either.

Current law already allows people to be deported for committing fraud. Individuals can become deportable if they are convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, or CIMT, for which a sentence of 1 year or longer may be imposed. The fraud offenses in this bill carry maximum penalties between 1 and 30 years, which clearly meet the 1-year minimum required for deportability.

Additionally, multiple fraud offenses are specifically defined as aggravated felonies, if the crime carries a sentence of 1 year or more. Conviction or an aggravated felony makes a person deportable, but the key word here, Mr. Speaker, is "conviction."

This bill is really about stripping due process and making it easier to deport immigrants with lawful status, like green card holders. Under this bill, a green card holder who has been in this country for decades could be deported without a conviction. Under current law, most deportability grounds require a person to be convicted of a crime.

As a result, if this bill were to become law, it would be easier to deport someone for fraud offenses than it would be to deport them for murder, rape, or sexual abuse of a minor.

We should all ask ourselves: Why are Republicans again trying to deport people who came here legally without requiring a criminal conviction and without any due process?

Why are they constantly trying to fearmonger Americans into thinking that fraud among immigrants is a giant problem?

Could it be, Mr. Speaker, to distract from the mega corporations that are

bankrolling Republican campaigns, getting Republican tax cuts, all while screwing working Americans and spiking prices?

At a time when DHS agents are killing, arresting, and unlawfully entering the homes of U.S. citizens and immigrants alike, when the Department of Homeland Security is defying court orders, violating constitutional rights, and unleashing violence and chaos in cities across the country, the Republican response is to hand this out-of-control agency yet even more power.

This is another bill that is straight out of the Republican playbook that we have seen over and over again. It is an attack on two things that have been a core part of America since day one: immigration and due process. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

□ 1350

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

Mr. Speaker, my friend from Washington objects to the provision that says if an alien admits to fraud, that should be enough to deport them. They demand a criminal conviction. How ironic that the Democrats are quick to take an alien's word when he illegally enters the country, gives a fake name, and claims asylum, but they can't take his word when he admits to committing crimes in the United States.

An admission of guilt is an admission of guilt. That ought to be enough to trigger the provisions of this law, and this is not even breaking new ground. In fact, the language in this bill is identical to the grounds for inadmissibility for a multitude of circumstances.

An alien can be removed for overstaying his visa, violating his non-immigrant status or a condition of entry, smuggling aliens, committing marriage fraud, being a drug user or drug addict, falsely claiming U.S. citizenship, or engaging in espionage, all without a conviction.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I don't mean to respond, but I am going to have to respond here. I am going to first include in the RECORD: "Biden clemency for committed fraudsters met with outrage: 'Slap in the face.'"

[From FoxNews.com, Dec. 17, 2024]

BIDEN CLEMENCY FOR CONVICTED FRAUDSTERS MET WITH OUTRAGE: 'SLAP IN THE FACE'

(By Breanne Deppisch, Alec Schemmel)

President Biden made history last week when he granted clemency to more than 1,500 people with a sweeping list of commutations and pardons.

However, the move was met with fierce backlash from critics pointing out various names on the clemency list included individuals who cost taxpayers tens of millions of dollars through their fraudulent actions.

Among those covered in what the Biden White House is calling the largest single-day act of clemency by a U.S. president was Rita Crundwell, a former comptroller in Dixon, Illinois. Crundwell was convicted and sentenced to nearly 20 years behind bars for

using her position to steal nearly \$54 million from the small town best known for the boyhood home of Ronald Reagan.

Also on the list was former New York law partner Paul M. Daugerdas, who was sentenced to 15 years in prison for his role in a multibillion-dollar tax fraud scheme described by prosecutors as one of the largest criminal tax fraud cases in U.S. history, as well as Toyosi Alatishe, who abused his position as a caretaker for patients with severe mental deficiencies and physical disabilities by using their personal information to file fraudulent tax returns.

In response to Biden's decision to grant clemency to Crundwell, Republican Illinois state Sen. Andrew Chesney called the move "nothing short of a slap in the face to the people of Dixon."

"Her crimes did not only affect the taxpayers of Dixon, but they also had a rippling effect across the region and state, as communities became subject to stricter, more tedious regulations," Chesney said in a statement following the commutation of Crundwell's sentence. "First, it was the pardoning of his son, and now Biden is apparently extending clemency to anyone with political connections, including corrupt government employees. It's sickening."

Illinois Republican Rep. Darin LaHood echoed Chesney's remarks about the commutation being a "slap in the face" to those impacted by Crundwell's crime, adding that "while many families in Dixon were living paycheck to paycheck, [Crundwell] took advantage of their trust in government and used her access to live an unearned life of luxury."

In addition to schemes that defrauded public funds, many of the commutations Biden handed out went to white-collar criminals accused of defrauding their clients out of millions of dollars. Meanwhile, Biden also commuted the sentence of Michael Conahan, a former judge who imposed harsh sentences against juveniles in exchange for \$2.8 million in illegal payments in what became known as a "kids for cash" scandal.

"I want to see [Conahan's] name removed because that's just . . . another slap in the face, another injustice, on top of all of the grief that everybody in this community has already endured," said Sandy Fonzo, whose son Edward committed suicide after being sent to a juvenile detention center for eight months after getting caught drinking underage.

The administration commuted sentences for inmates who were on home confinement during the COVID-19 pandemic and who "have successfully reintegrated into their families and communities," according to the announcement.

This includes verification that the person's primary or a prior offense was not violent, a sex offense, or terrorism-related; ensured a low or minimum recidivism risk; and confirmed that the person was not engaged in violent or gang-related activity while incarcerated. All were on good behavior, and the decisions were not made on an individual basis.

Between 2017 and 2021, then-President Trump granted just 143 pardons and 93 sentence commutations—amounting to just 2 percent of the clemency applications that his administration received, according to available Justice Department data.

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman would have us believe is that Rita Crundwell, who stole \$54 million from Dixon, Illinois, repaid that \$54 million before she received her pardon. That is what we would have to believe.

We would have to believe that Paul M. Daugerdas, sentenced to 15 years in

prison for his role in a multibillion-dollar tax fraud scheme, one of the largest in history, had reimbursed the Federal Government for those multibillion dollars.

We would have to believe that Toyosi Alatishe, who abused his position as a caretaker for patients by filing fraudulent tax returns on behalf of these poor folks, paid everything back.

There is no indication of that from the Dixon, Illinois, folks. No indication at all.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have made my case.

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

That was an amazing evasion of what we are really talking about.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the Cato Institute study, "President Trump's Pardons: An Embarrassment of Riches."

[From the Cato Institute Blog, Feb. 11, 2026]

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S PARDONS: AN EMBARRASSMENT OF RICHES

(By Dan Greenberg)

Yesterday, I described the final scandal of the Clinton administration: Bill Clinton's midnight pardon of Marc Rich. If the Rich pardon was a snowflake, then the pardons of President Trump's second term are a blizzard.

The scope and magnitude of Trump's second-term pardons are unprecedented. Joe Biden granted 80 pardons in his four-year term, but Trump's pardons make his predecessor's look like a drop in the bucket. In the first year of the second Trump administration, the president issued 166 individual pardons, as well as a mass pardon that erased the verdicts of more than 1,500 January 6 Capitol rioters. In other words, even putting aside the rioters' collective pardon, Trump is now issuing pardons at eight times the rate Biden did. Nonetheless, the fact that a president issues more pardons than his predecessors is not necessarily problematic. The real problem lies in the great number of particular second-term pardons that appear indefensible. Such pardons fall into five categories.

First: Biden's pardons eliminated roughly \$680,000 in financial penalties (fines, restitution, and forfeitures) owed to victims or the government. In contrast, Liz Oyer, the former lead pardon attorney of the United States, has calculated that Trump's second-term pardons have forgiven criminal debts of more than \$1.5 billion. This staggering sum—composed of money owed to crime victims and to government treasuries—has been zeroed out by presidential edict.

Trump's pardon pen was a boon to ex-criminals like Trevor Milton (who no longer must repay the investors he defrauded \$660 million) and Lawrence Duran (who no longer must repay the government he defrauded \$87 million). It was also a boon to HDR Global Trading Ltd., which owed the nation a \$100 million fine; in this case, Trump also made history by granting the nation's very first pardon to a corporation.

Second: Trump has normalized the pardoning of disgraced politicians, such as former Honduran president Juan Orlando Hernandez (who orchestrated a spree of state-sponsored drug trafficking leading to a 45-year prison term), Nevada legislator Michele Fiore (who embezzled \$70,000 out of a police memorial fund for personal expenses like rent and plastic surgery), Virginia sheriff Scott Jenkins (who handed out badges to untrained businessmen in exchange for

\$75,000 in bribes), and Tennessee House Speaker Glen Casada (who defrauded state government with a fake-payee kickback scheme). Perhaps I should disclose my proximity to one such pardon recipient, Arkansas legislator Jeremy Hutchinson (who traded official acts for bribes, embezzled from campaign funds, and filed false tax returns); Hutchinson's tenure in the state Senate, which ended with simultaneous indictments in three federal districts, began when he defeated me in a Republican primary.

Third: Trump's pardons are beginning to undermine the contemporaneous work of his own Department of Justice. Alina Habba, Trump's own US attorney in New Jersey, announced Joseph Schwartz's three-year sentence for \$38 million in tax fraud in April; Trump pardoned him seven months later. Real estate developer Timothy Leiweke was charged earlier this year with conspiring to rig the bidding process for a Texas sports arena; Trump pardoned him in December. Federal investigators and prosecutors must find such pardons demoralizing and self-negating.

Fourth: [REDACTED] For instance, the ordinary vetting procedures of the Office of the Pardon Attorney have often been sidestepped. Formality in pardon deliberation is desirable because it immunizes the president from the appearance of pay-to-play; the absence of such formality makes it plausible that a multitude of recent pardons are transactional. Trump pardoned Paul Walczak (who evaded millions of dollars in taxes) after Walczak's mother raised millions of dollars for MAGA candidates and paid a million dollars to dine with the president at Mar-a-Lago. Trevor Milton—the securities fraudster mentioned above—donated \$1.8 million to Trump's campaign before a presidential pardon wiped out all \$660 million of his restitution obligations. (That is, if nothing else, an impressive ROI.)

Before Trump pardoned Changpeng Zhao—who headed the cryptocurrency exchange Binance while it fostered more than 1.5 million illegal virtual trades as well as prohibited transactions to Al Qaeda, Isis, and Hamas—Zhao had brokered a \$2 billion investment in Eric and Donald Trump Jr.'s cryptocurrency business, World Liberty Financial. (When asked about Zhao in a subsequent 60 Minutes interview, Trump explained, "I have no idea who he is. I was told that he was a victim, just like I was and just like many other people, of a vicious, horrible group of people in the Biden administration.")

[REDACTED] Trump evidently hoped Cuellar would return the favor by switching parties to the GOP; when that didn't happen, the president released an angry statement on Truth Social, criticizing Cuellar for "Such a lack of LOYALTY, something that Texas Voters, and Henry's daughters, will not like. Oh well, next time, no more Mr. Nice guy!" Previous presidents would surely take offense at the suggestion that a pardon could be traded for something of value; [REDACTED]

Fifth: Here is another occasion for alarm bells: Donald Trump has increasingly focused on providing pardons to his campaign supporters who stretched or broke the law, such as John Eastman, Rudy Giuliani, and Jenna Ellis. (As the president's pardon attorney, Ed Martin, famously explained on X, "No MAGA left behind.") Indeed, Trump apparently views the exercise of his pardon authority to forgive federal crimes as insufficient; Trump's inability to eliminate state-level convictions has apparently led him to pressure state government officials to pardon state-level offenses related to the 2020 elections.

I am not the only Cato analyst who has explained the risks of political and constitutional crisis created by presidential attempts to get state-level election criminals pardoned; normalizing such actions will inevitably create ripple effects in future elections. Historically, the central principle of the Justice Department's role in elections has been "prosecution, not intervention." The latest edition of the DOJ's governing manual in this sphere, Federal Prosecution of Election Offenses, explains that the states have primary responsibility for overseeing elections—and that any federal investigation of elections must minimize the likelihood of affecting that election or otherwise "chill legitimate voting activities."

That edition of the manual has disappeared from Justice's website. Bob Bauer, Obama's former White House counsel, has speculated that the manual is being revised to match Trump's goal of "nationalization" of election administration.

The Supreme Court has explained that pardons are justified if "the public welfare will be better served." It is impossible to see how the public welfare is served by many of Trump's pardons today. The president's power to pardon federal crimes is practically absolute. It cannot be modified by Congress. Furthermore, just as an uninvolved citizen lacks standing to challenge a prosecutor's actions, a third party likewise may not challenge the grant of a presidential pardon. [REDACTED] It looks like the floodgates will remain open for the foreseeable future. Perhaps future presidents will behave better; perhaps a future constitutional amendment will encourage them to do so.

At least the specter of corruption in previous presidential administrations (Clinton's pardon of Marc Rich, or Biden's pardon of his son) appeared to be an exception to the rule. [REDACTED]

Mr. RASKIN. In it, it answers the question between the gentleman and me. I thought that I was submitting a very simple, humble request, that he withdraw the false statement that Joe Biden, as President, had forgiven hundreds of millions of dollars in fines and restitution. That is an absolute falsehood. It is inaccurate.

Now, look, let's start with this: I am going to educate the gentleman to the extent that he wants to be educated any further on the matter about the difference between pardons in the Biden administration and the Trump administration.

Joe Biden granted a total of 80 pardons in his 4-year term. President Trump issued 166 individual pardons in his first year and then, of course, famously, the mass pardon of 1,500 January 6 rioters and insurrectionists who stormed this Chamber and the Capitol.

I am quoting directly from the Cato study, for the benefit of the gentleman from Arizona: "Biden's pardons eliminated roughly \$680,000 in financial penalties (fines, restitution, and forfeitures) owed to victims or the government."

This is money that a court has determined is owed and must be paid. Biden forgave \$680,000. Now, I am sure that if you are one of the victims, you are not happy to hear about that, that that was forgiven, but that is within the power of the President.

"In contrast, Liz Oyer, the former lead pardon attorney of the United

States, has calculated that Trump's second-term pardons—that is just 1 year of pardons—"have forgiven criminal debts"—fines, restitution, and forfeitures—"of more than \$1.5 billion."

In other words, Biden didn't even forgive \$1 million. President Trump has forgiven more than \$1.5 billion to the fraudsters, white-collar criminals, and scammers who have found their way to Mar-a-Lago and the White House and have been able to finagle the pardon that they always wanted.

"This staggering sum," as the Cato Institute puts it, "has been zeroed out by Presidential edict."

That is in a completely different galaxy than what President Biden or any other President, Democrat or Republican, has done in American history. It is stratospheric.

I am glad that the gentleman's blatant misstatement and his refusal to retract it have given us the opportunity to focus on this extraordinary corruption that is taking place because it tells the true story of fraud and how fraud is being treated by the current administration.

Cato says to consider the case of Trevor Milton, "who no longer must repay the investors he defrauded \$660 million" that he owed them. Take the case of Lawrence Duran, "who no longer must repay the government he defrauded \$87 million."

You can add up all the people who were pardoned by President Biden, and you don't even get to \$1 million. Then, you have individual criminals whom Donald Trump pardoned after they made various kinds of overtures to the White House or showed up at Mar-a-Lago, and those people were getting hundreds of millions of dollars or tens of millions of dollars forgiven in fines.

The gentleman got back up to say these people were either convicted for or accused of tens of millions of dollars in fraud under President Biden. I am talking about what a court ordered them to pay. That is the apples-to-apples comparison that the gentleman doesn't want to deal with.

It is interesting that he happened upon that particular issue because it is not one that benefits their side of the argument at all, as they claim to be interested in saving the victims of fraud.

Victims of fraud, thousands of them, have lost more than a billion dollars because of the pardons of Donald Trump. That is the direct policy of the administration.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I can't blame the ranking member for digressing into his Trump derangement syndrome. That is a lot easier, I suspect, than explaining why Democrats believe that aliens who have defrauded American taxpayers and stolen people's identities should remain in our country. That is their sanctuary policy in a nutshell. I

wouldn't want to try to defend that either.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HARRIS).

Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we have a massive fraud problem in America. Fraud costs our country an estimated \$233 billion to \$521 billion each year.

Just recently, in Minnesota, allegations have been brought against a group of Somali immigrants running fraudulent daycares with American tax dollars.

The bill we are considering today, the Deporting Fraudsters Act, ensures that aliens who commit acts of fraud or fraudulently receive public benefits face the consequences of their actions. This creates grounds of inadmissibility and deportability for any alien who admits to or is convicted of certain fraud offenses.

The worst part of the Minnesota case, we all know, was the actions of lawmakers who decided they would rather cover it up than see the perpetrators brought to justice. Unfortunately, I think we will see that same behavior today with this vote.

Time and time again, we have seen our colleagues on the other side of the aisle refuse to prioritize American citizens over aliens.

Let me remind all Americans: We just saw an example of this recently at the State of the Union Address when President Trump asked us to stand if we believed the most important priority of the Federal Government is to protect American citizens, and all of America watched as Democrats refused to stand. The American people saw a party that is unable to put their interests first.

Living in America as a noncitizen is a privilege, and when people abuse that privilege, they must be held responsible. We must be a nation that follows the rule of law. We must punish illegal aliens who are misusing taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to put American citizens above alien fraudsters and vote "yes" on this bill.

□ 1400

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

Mr. Speaker, some of our colleagues jump up like a jack-in-the-box whenever the President tells them to do that. Others in the Chamber want to stand up for American citizens exercising their First and Second Amendment rights, like Alex Pretti and Renee Good. They were shot down by ICE agents, who somehow believed that, with this Trump administration, they are above the law and beyond the law.

We are going to stand up with the American people. We are not going to take orders from the executive branch, which is utterly humiliating and self-defeating for a Member of the Article I

branch of the Congress of the United States.

The gentleman, I think, accuses us of something he called the deranged Trump syndrome, which I can only imagine means following a President who plunges the country into an illegal, unauthorized, undeclared war, spending \$1 billion or \$2 billion a day, and then not asking any questions about it because somehow you think your political destiny is intertwined with the President, who has shown no loyalty to the people who show loyalty to him. That is a personal problem on their part. We don't have deranged Trump syndrome. I think that falls on that side of the aisle.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let's just step back and understand the Democrats' position for a second.

First, they were for a wide-open border. You don't have to take my word for it, just remember what we saw. Every single day for 4 years of the Biden administration, people were lining up on the southern border, camping out under the bridges in the various towns along the border, 8 million to 10 million people in a 4-year timeframe.

They were all fine with that. They lost track of 300,000 kids during that time.

Then, another position they were for was to abolish ICE. They don't want to enforce our immigration laws. No. We have to abolish ICE. Being doxed, tracked, harassed, spit on, sworn at, and attacked, and making death threats on ICE agents and their families, as if that wasn't enough, now the Democrats say we want to get rid of them altogether. That is really going to help the situation in our country.

Third, they are for sanctuary jurisdictions. We just passed legislation in our committee 2 weeks ago to deal with this in 18 cities, 11 States, 3 counties, the District of Columbia. Mr. Speaker, 31½ percent of the population of this country resides in a jurisdiction where leftwing political leaders tell local law enforcement not to work with Federal law enforcement when it comes to enforcing Federal law. That is maybe one of the dumbest things I have ever heard, but that is their position.

Guess what. Last year alone, 17,864 times a detainer was filed at the local jail, local detention center, when an illegal migrant was in that facility and charged with another crime, and ICE files a detainer and says: If you are going to let him out, give us a heads-up. Just tell us. We will come to apprehend the individual there in the jail so we don't have to do it on the street where our agents are going to be spit

on, harassed, sworn at, and attacked. Just let us do it at the jail.

These jurisdictions said no, and now here we are today.

Mr. Speaker, the final one: If you find some fraudster who is a naturalized citizen and rips off the taxpayers, you can't deport them. They are, like, no, we are not going to deport them. We are going to give them, as the chairman said, sanctuary here in the country.

These are the most ridiculous positions: open border, abolish ICE, sanctuary jurisdiction, and don't deport fraudsters who are here.

This is craziness, but that is their position, and this bill is so common sense.

I thank Mr. TAYLOR for sponsoring this legislation. I think it was Sarah Huckabee Sanders a few years ago who said in a response to President Biden that the divide in America today is normal versus crazy. This is just normal, commonsense stuff. Every position they take is crazy.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. TAYLOR and our chairman, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, for the great work they have done on this legislation, and I urge a "yes" vote.

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

Mr. Speaker, there is such a thick fog of propaganda and disinformation in the Chamber that I think we have lost sight of what the bill is about and what the law is.

The law is very clear today, which is: Conviction of a criminal fraud offense is already a deportable offense. It already gets you deported. That is why the majority began with a whole litany of cases where people were being deported after committing crimes.

They didn't like the fact that they had the right to appeal it. They don't like the fact that there is due process, but they appealed it. Then, they were deported. That is what the law is.

Their bill is simply an effort to say you don't need a conviction anymore. You could just deport them based on hearsay evidence. An ICE agent says that this person admitted to me that they had committed fraud, and that substitutes for a prosecution, trial, and conviction by a jury.

In the meantime, we have hundreds of judges in America who are condemning ICE for lying in court. We have Department of Justice lawyers who are saying literally in court that their job sucks because they can't defend what is taking place with ICE. We have judge after judge denouncing the fantastical, misleading, deceptive, mendacious testimony of people from ICE, and now you want to just trust an ICE agent to say this person admitted to me that they committed criminal fraud. We are just going to kick them out of the country without a trial.

Thomas Jefferson said during the Alien and Sedition Acts that there are people who want to strip away the rights of aliens and who will inevitably come to attack the rights of citizens,

too. We already saw that in Minneapolis.

There were a lot of people in this Chamber willing to look the other way when they were knocking down the doors of immigrants without a search warrant, without probable cause, when they were roughing up immigrants, or when immigrants were dying in custody. Then, suddenly, these ICE agents thought they could get away with it when it comes to U.S. citizens, and that is when America woke up to this threat and said no.

ICE agents are not superior to the rule of law. They are not above and beyond the law. Even President Trump understood that, which is why he has pulled a lot of people out of Minneapolis. They wanted to change the subject. They said stop using the words "mass deportation."

A majority of the American people reject these authoritarian tactics that have been unleashed against both citizens and immigrants.

This is a nation of laws. It is a nation under the rule of law and under the Constitution. Their bill is, at best, if not completely redundant, unnecessary, and silly, a gloss on what the law already is, which is that if you are convicted of fraud and you are an immigrant, you get kicked out of the country. You are removed. They want to pick a fight on a nonsensical problem.

We don't need to degrade our own rule of law by taking action against people without a criminal conviction. The criminal justice system works just fine, so we should be encouraging government agents not to lie to judges, not to render false testimony, as judges across the country have been saying. Both Republican and Democratic appointees have been rejecting what is coming out of this administration.

This bill, as far as I know, is not about naturalized citizens. I think our distinguished chairman said something about that. He may have gotten it confused with another bill, but this bill is unnecessary and redundant.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, my friend seems so overwrought that he is simply misspeaking and doing so quite prolifically.

This bill does not say that you can deport on hearsay evidence. It says you must deport upon a conviction or an admission of guilt. That is it, and there are many offenses that already fall under this same process, and the standards are rigorous.

The alien's admission must be explicit, unequivocal, and unqualified. The immigration judge has to find that the admission fits within the relevant statutes and that the admission is based on reasonable, substantial, and probative evidence.

The Democrats clearly aren't interested in due process. They are interested in gumming up the process so

that the illegal alien criminals can remain in this country, preying on Americans.

□ 1410

Mr. Speaker, that is the whole point of their sanctuary cities and the whole point of their opposition to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TAYLOR), the author of this legislation.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. McCLINTOCK for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, the Deporting Fraudsters Act. As Mr. HARRIS just said earlier, estimates show that between \$233 billion and \$521 billion is lost to fraud each year. These funds are taxpayer dollars from American workers, intended to go to Americans who need help getting back on their feet, not to illegal alien fraudsters who shouldn't even be in our country to begin with.

The massive fraud we have seen in Minnesota and other places around the country should be a no-brainer. If a person is not an American citizen while defrauding the American people, they should not be able to walk freely in this country.

The story that inspired this bill originally came from California where five foreign nationals were apprehended with over 160 fraudulent SNAP cards on them. These were non-Americans stealing from the most vulnerable among us. It needs to end.

Democrats have used American taxpayer dollars to attract and retain an electoral majority for too long. To my Democratic colleagues, the bill before us is a binary choice. Do they support the American people, or do they support illegal immigrants who steal American tax dollars?

Failing to support this bill is betraying the Americans whose interests Democrats claim to represent. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, before the distinguished gentleman leaves, I would be happy to yield to him for an answer to a question.

The bill, as he originally introduced it, required a criminal conviction. I wonder why it was changed and whether that was changed with his approval or not. What was the logic for changing it?

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TAYLOR) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. RASKIN for the question.

Mr. Speaker, it was not part of the original text. It was suggested in Committee. This was in the Judiciary Committee. I wasn't a party to those conversations. I was consulted about the decision to add that, and I fully supported it.

Mr. RASKIN. Representative TAYLOR, this is your bill, H.R. 1958. It begins like this:

"Any alien who has been convicted of an offense that involves defrauding the

United States Government or unlawfully receiving a Federal public benefit . . . or a State or local public benefit . . . is deportable."

You have got the language of "convicted" in there. It was changed by the Committee. I am just wondering: Why did you originally have it in such a way as to require a conviction?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am not sure I got what you said there. It requires a conviction unless there is an admission.

Mr. RASKIN. That is the way it has been changed. It has been altered to that. When you introduced it, it required a conviction. I am just wondering: What was your original logic, and why did you change your mind about that, if you did? Maybe you didn't.

Mr. TAYLOR. In looking back at that, it is probably something I should have included in the original text. If the person is going to admit it, they probably should be deported, obviously, if they are admitting it.

It is something that is, honestly, apparently commonly occurring at the border as people come in.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I will reclaim my time.

I supported the original vision. It was basically unnecessary because it was a restatement of what the law is, to put it all in one place, so I could certainly support that.

Then your language was completely diluted in committee to open up this huge, gaping hole to say that you don't need a criminal conviction before deporting someone. We have enumerated the problems with that.

For one thing, it deprives victims of a crime the opportunity to be heard and perhaps to get their restitution and to get their proper justice in court.

Also, it sets a terrible precedent. This is the Thomas Jefferson point. When we say we are going to have lesser standards relating to immigrants, that then carries over to citizens. We have seen already in this huge immigration roundup what that means in terms of the trampling of the rights of our people under the Bill of Rights.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in this situation my read of the bill is an un-withdrawn admission is the same as a guilty verdict. This is a person who has admitted they have broken the law. Therefore, they sit in the same position as someone who has been convicted of it, if they are not even going to say: Oh, no, actually I didn't break the law. They admitted it. They are deportable.

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

Mr. Speaker, the ranking member should know that once the bill is introduced, it leaves the control of the individual Member and becomes the prop-

erty of the House and is subject to modification by a majority of the House.

I must say I find his objections rather curious, considering the fact that dozens of House Democrats have supported requiring an admission for a ground of deportability included as part of the Consequences for Social Security Fraud Act, which was approved by 55 House Democrats just 2 years ago. That was legislation that I introduced and is now incorporated into this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the CBO Cost Estimate for this bill.

H.R. 1958, DEPORTING FRAUDSTERS ACT OF 2026 AS REPORTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY ON JANUARY 27, 2026

	By fiscal year, millions of dollars		
	2026	2026–2030	2026–2035
Direct Spending (Outlays) ..	*	*	*
Revenues .....	*	*	*
Increase or Decrease (–) in the Deficit .....	*	*	*
Spending Subject to Appropriation (Outlays) .....	*	*	*

\* = between –\$500,000 and \$500,000.

Increases *net direct spending* in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2036? No.

Increases *on-budget deficits* in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2036? No.

Statutory pay-as-you-go procedures apply? Yes.

Mandate Effects:

Contains intergovernmental mandate? No.  
Contains private-sector mandate? No.

H.R. 1958 would make an alien (a non-U.S. national) inadmissible to or deportable from the United States if that person admits to or is convicted of crimes involving defrauding the United States government or the unlawful receipt of a federal, state, or local public benefit.

Under current law, a crime involving fraud can be deemed to be a crime involving moral turpitude; the admission of or conviction for such a crime makes an alien inadmissible or, in certain cases, deportable. Therefore, CBO expects that only a few people would be removed from the United States based solely on enacting this bill. Because some of those aliens might be eligible for federal benefits—some of which are provided through income tax credits—CBO estimates that enacting the bill would decrease spending subject to appropriation and direct spending and increase revenues by an insignificant amount over the 2026–2035 period.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is David Rafferty. The estimate was reviewed by H. Samuel Papenfuss, Deputy Director of Budget Analysis.

PHILLIP L. SWAGEL,  
Director, Congressional Budget Office.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for this lively debate. This bill is redundant. It is unnecessary. It is dangerous in terms of eroding a basic principle that we have, which is that there should be full due process and people should not be deported without a criminal conviction. The prosecution is

not always right, but also everybody should have their day in court, including the victims.

At a time when we have seen Big Brother bloated beyond belief in terms of budget and in terms of power, the last thing we should do is to look for further ways to aggrandize the power of the executive branch at this point.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the question before us is a simple one. Should an alien who is here in this country as a guest of America be deported if they commit fraud and steal the funds of American families and American taxpayers or if they commit identity theft by stealing the Social Security numbers of American citizens?

That should not be a difficult question for anyone with a lick of common sense. We have enough problems with domestic criminals without tolerating the presence of criminals from every other country in the world.

If a person is a foreigner and commits fraud in this country, they need to go home and never be allowed to return. The Democrats want these criminals to stay. The Republicans want them to go. I don't wonder for a moment where the American people stand.

President Trump put a very simple and revealing proposition to the Democrats during his recent State of the Union Address. The first duty of the American Government is to defend the American people and not illegal aliens.

The Democrats made their answer crystal clear for the entire world to see. I am willing to bet they haven't learned a thing since then, but I am pleased to put that proposition to them today in this form. Should foreigners who commit fraud against the American people be allowed to stay in our country, "yes" or "no"?

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1115, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1420

### PROTECTING ACCESS FOR HUNTERS AND ANGLERS ACT

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1115, I call up the bill (H.R. 556) to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture from prohibiting the use of lead ammunition or tackle on certain Federal land or water under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1115, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 556

*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 "Protecting Access for Hunters and Anglers Act".*

#### SEC. 2. PROTECTING ACCESS FOR HUNTERS AND ANGLERS ON FEDERAL LAND AND WATER.

*(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in section 20.21 or 20.108 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act), and subsection (b), the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service or the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, and the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service (referred to in this section as the "applicable Secretary"), may not—*

*(1) prohibit the use of lead ammunition or tackle on Federal land or water that is—*

*(A) under the jurisdiction of the applicable Secretary; and*

*(B) made available for hunting or fishing activities; or*

*(2) issue regulations relating to the level of lead in ammunition or tackle to be used on Federal land or water described in paragraph (1).*

*(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a prohibition or regulations described in that subsection that are limited to a specific unit of Federal land or water, if the applicable Secretary determines that—*

*(1) a decline in wildlife population at the specific unit of Federal land or water is primarily caused by the use of lead in ammunition or tackle, based on the field data from the specific unit of Federal land or water; and*

*(2) the prohibition or regulations, as applicable, are—*

*(A) consistent with the law of the State in which the specific Federal land or water is located;*

*(B) consistent with an applicable policy of the fish and wildlife department of the State in which the specific Federal land or water is located; or*

*(C) approved by the applicable fish and wildlife department of the State in which the specific Federal land or water is located.*

*(c) FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICE.—The applicable Secretary shall include in a Federal Register notice with respect to any prohibition or regulations that meet the requirements of paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) an explanation of how the prohibition or regulations, as applicable, meet those requirements.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 556.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 556, sponsored by my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

This commonsense bill protects hunters' and anglers' ability to continue using cost-effective lead ammunition and fishing equipment on our Federal lands. At the same time, this legislation gives land management agencies the flexibility to make targeted decisions on lead usage based on sound science and in coordination with State fish and wildlife agencies.

In the United States, sportsmen and -women participation is crucial to the success of wildlife conservation. The North American Model of Wildlife Conservation operates on seven interdependent principles. Embedded in these principles are sound science, active management, and access to hunting and fishing.

The success of this model is best characterized by the millions of dollars that hunters and anglers pay for wildlife conservation each year, mainly through excise taxes on firearms, ammunition, and fishing tackle.

In fiscal year 2026, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service apportioned over \$800 million in receipts from excise taxes on firearms manufacturers alone. Of that, nearly \$700 million was for wildlife restoration. Similarly, \$442 million was generated from excise taxes on fishing equipment for fish conservation.

It was with this in mind that the Trump administration changed the paradigm for hunting and fishing on Federal lands earlier this year.

Historically, Federal lands were considered closed to hunting and fishing unless specific regulations were issued to allow these activities in certain places. With the signing of Secretarial Order No. 3447 by Secretary Burgum, Federal lands are now considered to be open for hunting and fishing unless existing authorities and unit purposes require an area to be closed.

This change charts a path forward toward opening thousands of acres of