

Gresham, OR 97080  
Jan 30th, 2015

House Rules Committee  
Chair Val Hoyle  
Vice-Chair Barbara Smith Warner  
Vice-Chair Vic Gillam  
Members  
Rep. Phil Barnhart  
Rep Bill Kennemer  
Rep Mike McLane  
Rep Rob Nosse  
Rep Dan Rayfield  
Rep Carl Wilson  
Oregon State Capital  
Salem, OR

Honorable Chair Hoyle, Vice Chairs Smith Warner and Gilliam, and Members of the House Rules Committee,

**I am writing to you in opposition of HB 2177**

This bill is Oregon's version of Universal Voter Registration.

**This bill will allow non citizens to slip through the system and vote in our elections.** It does not exclude people who are not citizens, or yet to prove their citizenship. It only says the SOS will get information from DMV. Some of the data in DMV data base is inconclusive on citizenship. So, currently, those people are given the benefit of doubt and identified as able to register. Jim Williams' letter (linked below and also attached) to Rep Sal Esquivel states their current practice does not exclude people from being confirmed that are non citizens. It states that though the DMV currently sends data to Elections division, they do not get all the citizens' information and only confirm name, address and other demographics,

no confirmation of citizenship is required. Non citizens can be registered.  
<https://www.scribd.com/doc/245120123/Williams-Letter-to-Rep-Esquivel> .

**Every vote by a non citizen takes away the rights of citizens to determine our government leaders.** The Oregon Constitution says that citizens shall be entitled to vote if they meet requirements. It gives no rights to non citizens to vote. Elected officials have a sworn duty to protect these rights.  
Article II Section 2 [https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/bills\\_laws/Pages/OrConst.aspx](https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/bills_laws/Pages/OrConst.aspx)

Current holders of Oregon Driver's licenses include people from pre 2008 rules, when positive proof of citizenship was not required. Those people will not be out of the DMV system until 2017.

Oregon DACA non citizens can get a driver's license: [http://www.oregonlive.com/pacific-northwest-news/index.ssf/2013/01/young\\_oregon\\_immigrants\\_grante.html](http://www.oregonlive.com/pacific-northwest-news/index.ssf/2013/01/young_oregon_immigrants_grante.html) .

Non citizens have gotten driver's licenses in 10 other states. This article shows they are using false ID. It is such a problem in California that elected officials are deciding not to criminalize non citizens for committing ID theft. <http://www.breitbart.com/california/2015/01/27/exclusive-california-dmv-ordered-to-overlook-identity-theft-by-illegals/>

Non Citizens are voting in enough numbers to change our elections. This is a nationwide study from Harvard and is ongoing. The CCES study in 2008 and 2010 show enough non citizens voting to change those elections. This article was written by the authors of the study.  
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/monkey-cage/wp/2014/10/24/could-non-citizens-decide-the-november-election/>

Peer reviewed articles on this study are available at <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/02613794> which cost \$19.95 and I would violate a copyright law if I submit it with this testimony.

Going forward, if the legislature were to again pass a bill that would allow non citizens to get Driver's licenses sometime in the future, even after Measure 88 was rejected at last year's election, this bill would further allow non citizens to be registered to vote.

**Election systems that are not creditable undermine the rule of law and increase the lack of respect for those who are elected. Citizens lose interest in participation because they perceive their efforts are futile .**

White Paper by the Heritage Foundation on Universal Voter Registration: <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/03/mandatory-voter-registration-how-universal-registration-threatens-electoral-integrity> .

If a non citizen votes after getting a ballot, they commit a felony. Since there is no request for registration there is no evidence of intent. There will hardly be any way to bring a case against them as the government has encouraged them materially to vote. It therefore allows voter fraud to go unchecked.

This bill removes sunshine from our voter rolls. Citizens must trust but can not verify that only citizens are on the voter rolls. This bill takes over the local control of County Clerks to registering voters in the conduction of the election. It centralizes that power to the Secretary of State.

Passing this bill will strip hardworking Oregonians of their rights to self determine their future. It effectively muzzles their voice. These are the citizens who only have one home. No country to which they can return if enough outsiders force their will on our homeland.

**Please do not pass this bill!**

Best Regards,  
Janice Dysinger



VOTE ON ESPN.COM

No purchase necessary.

SEARCH

HOME | SUBSCRIBE

BIG GOVERNMENT | BIG JOURNALISM | BIG HOLLYWOOD | NATIONAL SECURITY | BREITBART TV | BREITBART SPORTS | THE WIRES | 2016: THE RACE

BREITBART LONDON | BREITBART TEXAS | BREITBART CALIFORNIA

# EXCLUSIVE: CALIFORNIA DMV ORDERED TO OVERLOOK IDENTITY THEFT BY ILLEGALS

16308

0

1337



advertisement

by ADELE NAZARIAN | 27 Jan 2015 | Los Angeles, CA | 1295

## New Law Allows Undocumented Immigrants To Apply For Driver's Licenses

Los Angeles

CBS Los Angeles



## BREITBART VIDEO PICKS

What to Know Before Obama Rolls Out 2016 Budget



MORE VIDEOS:



## YOU MIGHT LIKE

Sponsored Links

3 Ways to Stay Safe All Seniors Should

Illegal aliens may enjoy a free pass on identity theft due to a new

## investigative policy at California's Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV).

The policy, issued last year and effective as of Jan. 1, 2015, directs DMV investigators to overlook identity theft by applicants "who may have attempted to obtain or been issued a license or ID card previously through submission of false information."

A DMV source who asked to remain anonymous provided Breitbart News exclusively with a copy of the newly-enacted internal policy memorandum. The document informs DMV investigative officers that past identity theft is acceptable when the illegally-acquired IDs were only used to obtain a [driver license](#), and where the license or ID was not used to commit any other crime.

It is unclear how investigators are meant to determine whether a falsely obtained driver license or ID was used solely for driving, or also to commit other crimes, such as using a fraudulently-obtained driver license to open a bank account, to apply for a loan, or even to purchase alcohol.

The policy seems to expect applicants to admit voluntarily to using a fraudulent driver license or ID for purposes other than driving a motor vehicle, if they did so.

Typically, identity theft [may be prosecuted](#) as a felony in California. The new DMV policy may be an attempt to protect illegal aliens from prosecution and conviction for a felony that could lead to their deportation, and disqualify them from President Barack Obama's new "executive amnesty" policy.

The source told Breitbart News: "My belief is that this policy came from the governor's office." The source added that a naturalized or natural born U.S. citizen who attempted to obtain a driver license fraudulently would not receive the same consideration, and would be prosecuted as a criminal.

"It's unethical and it goes directly against the law enforcement code of ethics," the anonymous source said of the new DMV policy.

A spokesperson for the California DMV told Breitbart News that while the agency "can't prove it if someone completely lied on their identity the first time," the DMV is constantly searching for "inconsistent information," and turns relevant cases in to the district attorney's office for prosecution.

"There is a chance we could miss someone," she cautioned, but assured Breitbart News that "investigators are constantly looking for cases" of identity theft.

Follow Adelle Nazarian on Twitter: [@AdelleNaz](#).

### READ MORE STORIES ABOUT:

[Breitbart California](#), [Illegal Aliens](#), [Jerry Brown](#), [Immigration](#), [executive amnesty](#), [California](#), [Mexico](#), [Border](#), [dmv](#), [Driver's licenses](#), [Deportation](#), [Fraud](#), [identity theft](#), [department of motor vehicles](#)

## We Recommend

### New U.S. Currency Law Now In Effect

Stansberry Research

**How 5 minutes can reduce your credit card interest payment to zero**

### Know

Philips Lifeline

### Drivers Who Don't Use This Trick Could Be Paying More

LMB Insurance

### This Chart is Keeping the White House Up at Night

Money Morning

### 10 Cars You Don't Want To See a Woman Get Out Of

Rant Cars

### Catch-up on Vikings Season 2 Now

HISTORY

### RA Symptoms That Actually Come from Other Diseases

Health Central

by Taboola

advertisement

advertisement

THE INFINITI COACHES' CHARITY CHALLENGE

Help Murray State's Coach Prohm Win \$100,000 For Charity

VOTE ON ESPN.COM

Official Corporate Partner of NCAA Basketball™  
NCAA is a registered trademark of the National Collegiate Athletic Association.

No purchase necessary.

advertisement

## MOST POPULAR

### Obama Won't Call Terror Fight a War on Radical Islam

2276 comments · 15 hours ago

### Freedom Lovers: Sarah Palin, Ted Nugent Team Up For Wild Day at Texas Ranch

6258 comments · 2 days ago

Sponsored Links by Taboola



# Could non-citizens decide the November election?

By **Jesse Richman and David Earnest** October 24, 2014

Could control of the Senate in 2014 be decided by illegal votes cast by non-citizens? Some argue that incidents of voting by non-citizens are so rare as to be [inconsequential](#), with efforts to block fraud a screen for an agenda to prevent poor and minority voters from exercising the franchise, while others define such incidents as a threat to [democracy itself](#). Both sides depend more heavily on anecdotes than data.

In a [forthcoming article](#) in the journal *Electoral Studies*, we bring real data from big social science survey datasets to bear on the question of whether, to what extent, and for whom non-citizens vote in U.S. elections. Most non-citizens do not register, let alone vote. But enough do that their participation can change the outcome of close races.

Our data comes from the [Cooperative Congressional Election Study](#) (CCES). Its large number of observations (32,800 in 2008 and 55,400 in 2010) provide sufficient samples of the non-immigrant sub-population, with 339 non-citizen respondents in 2008 and 489 in 2010. For the 2008 CCES, we also attempted to match respondents to voter files so that we could verify whether they actually voted.

How many non-citizens participate in U.S. elections? More than 14 percent of non-citizens in both the 2008 and 2010 samples indicated that they were registered to vote.

Furthermore, some of these non-citizens voted. Our best guess, based upon extrapolations from the portion of the sample with a verified vote, is that 6.4 percent of non-citizens voted in 2008 and 2.2 percent of non-citizens voted in 2010.

### Estimated Voter Turnout by Non-Citizens

	2008	2010
Self reported and/or verified	38 (11.3%)	13 (3.5%)
Self reported and verified	5 (1.5%)	N.A.
Adjusted estimate	21 (6.4%)	8 (2.2%)

Because non-citizens tended to favor Democrats (Obama won more than 80 percent of the votes of non-citizens in the 2008 CCES sample), we find that this participation was large enough to plausibly account for Democratic victories in a few close elections. Non-citizen votes could have given Senate Democrats the pivotal 60th vote needed to overcome filibusters in order to pass health-care reform and other Obama administration priorities in the 111th Congress. Sen. Al Franken (D-Minn.) won election in 2008 with a victory margin of 312 votes. Votes cast by just 0.65 percent of Minnesota non-citizens could account for this margin. It is also possible that non-citizen votes were responsible for Obama's 2008 victory in North Carolina. Obama won the state by 14,177 votes, so a turnout by 5.1 percent of North Carolina's adult non-citizens would have provided this victory margin.

We also find that one of the favorite policies advocated by conservatives to prevent voter fraud appears strikingly ineffective. Nearly three quarters of the non-citizens who indicated they were asked to provide photo identification at the polls claimed to have subsequently voted.

An alternative approach to reducing non-citizen turnout might emphasize public information. Unlike other populations, including naturalized citizens, education is not associated with higher participation among non-citizens. In 2008, non-citizens with less than a college degree were significantly more likely to cast a validated vote, and no non-citizens with a college degree or higher cast a validated vote. This hints at a link between non-citizen voting and lack of awareness about legal barriers.

There are obvious limitations to our research, which one should take account of when interpreting the results. Although the CCES sample is large, the non-citizen portion of the

sample is modest, with the attendant uncertainty associated with sampling error. We analyze only 828 self-reported non-citizens. Self-reports of citizen status might also be a source of error, although the appendix of our paper shows that the racial, geographic, and attitudinal characteristics of non-citizens (and non-citizen voters) are consistent with their self-reported status.

Another possible limitation is the matching process conducted by Catalist to verify registration and turnout drops many non-citizen respondents who cannot be matched. Our adjusted estimate assumes the implication of a “registered” or “voted” response among those who Catalist could not match is the same as for those whom it could. If one questions this assumption, one might focus only on those non-citizens with a reported and validated vote. This is the second line of the table.

Finally, extrapolation to specific state-level or district-level election outcomes is fraught with substantial uncertainty. It is obviously possible that non-citizens in California are more likely to vote than non-citizens in North Carolina, or vice versa. Thus, we are much more confident that non-citizen votes mattered for the Minnesota Senate race (a turnout of little more than one-tenth of our adjusted estimate is all that would be required) than that non-citizen votes changed the outcome in North Carolina.

Our research cannot answer whether the United States should move to legalize some electoral participation by non-citizens as [many other countries do](#), and as [some U.S. states did for more than 100 years](#), or find policies that [more effectively restrict it](#). But this research should move that debate a step closer to a common set of facts.

*Jesse Richman is Associate Professor of Political Science and International Studies at Old Dominion University, and Director of the ODU Social Science Research Center.*

*David Earnest is Associate Professor of Political Science and International Studies at Old Dominion University, and Associate Dean for Research & Graduate Studies in the College of Arts and Letters.*



# BACKGROUND

No. 2780 | MARCH 27, 2013

## Mandatory Voter Registration: How Universal Registration Threatens Electoral Integrity

*Hans A. von Spakovsky*

### Abstract

*There is no question that the U.S. voter registration system could be improved. However, the answer to America's voter registration problems is not federal mandates or federal interference in election administration. Indeed, the federal government has almost no experience administering elections; states administer elections in the laboratories of democracy. As a result of this exercise in federalism, states are implementing numerous improvements to the voter registration system—and they are doing it at less cost to our treasury, our Constitution, and the integrity of our elections than mandatory universal registration.*

It has been said that for every complex problem there is a solution that is clear, simple, and wrong. Washington soon may seek a complex solution—preemption of states' responsibility; federal micromanagement of elections; eventual coercion of lackadaisical citizens—to the nonproblem of people choosing not to vote.

—George F. Will<sup>1</sup>

Mandatory voter registration (MVR), previously termed “universal” registration, could significantly damage the integrity of America's voter registration system. The “voter registration modernization”<sup>2</sup> concept of automatically registering individuals through information contained in various existing government databases would throw the current system into chaos.

Specifically, voter registration modernization could result in the registration of large numbers of ineligible voters as well as multiple or duplicate registrations of the same individuals. When combined with the accompanying proposal that states allow any individuals who are not automatically

### KEY POINTS

- Mandatory voter registration (previously termed “universal” registration) could significantly damage the integrity of America's voter registration system.
- Census Bureau reports demonstrate that the major reason individuals failed to register was that they were not “interested in the election/not involved in politics,” not because they were disenfranchised.
- Electoral reforms—such as easing voter registration through motor-voter legislation, same-day registration, or uncoupling registration from jury duty—have had at best a negligible net effect on voter participation.
- It is rather ironic that many of the same organizations pushing to register individuals automatically from government databases oppose states' attempts to verify the accuracy of the information provided by individuals registering to vote by comparing to those same databases.
- States are implementing numerous improvements in their voter registration systems and at less cost to our treasury, our Constitution, and the integrity of our elections than mandatory universal registration.

This paper, in its entirety, can be found at <http://report.heritage.org/bg2780>

Produced by the Edwin Meese III Center for Legal and Judicial Studies

**The Heritage Foundation**  
214 Massachusetts Avenue, NE  
Washington, DC 20002  
(202) 546-4400 | [heritage.org](http://heritage.org)

Nothing written here is to be construed as necessarily reflecting the views of The Heritage Foundation or as an attempt to aid or hinder the passage of any bill before Congress.

registered to register and vote on Election Day, MVR presents a sure formula for registration and voter fraud that could damage the integrity of elections.

Automatically registering individuals to vote without their permission would also violate their basic right to choose whether they wish to participate in the U.S. political process. Indeed, this new scheme threatens one of American's most cherished liberties: the freedom to be left alone by the government.

### A "Solution" in Search of a Problem

**Lack of registration is not the reason people do not vote.** Ideological organizations such as FairVote and the Brennan Center for Justice are proposing that states automatically register all individuals to vote using existing government databases. Such proposals are based on the false premise that large numbers of Americans do not vote "for no

---

**Proposals that states automatically register all individuals to vote using "existing government databases" are based on the false premise that large numbers of Americans do not vote "for no other reason than they are not registered to vote."**

---

other reason than they are not registered to vote."<sup>3</sup> Yet after every federal election, the U.S. Census Bureau publishes reports on the levels of registration and voting, including surveys of individuals who do not vote, that *disprove* the claims that the major reason individuals do not vote is a lack of registration opportunities.<sup>4</sup>

For example, of the 146 million people who the Census Bureau reported were registered to vote in 2008, 15 million (10 percent) did not vote. Of those who did not vote, only 6 percent cited registration problems as the reason for not participating. Rather, the vast majority of these registered but nonvoters said they did not vote for reasons ranging from forgetting to vote to not liking the candidates or the campaign issues or simply not being interested.

With regard to those individuals who are not registered to vote, the Census Bureau's 2008 report demonstrates that the major reason individuals failed to register was that they were not "interested in the election/not involved in politics." That represented *46 percent* of the individuals in the Census Bureau's survey. Another 35 percent of individuals did not register for a variety of reasons such as not being eligible to vote, thinking their vote would not make a difference, not meeting residency requirements, or difficulty with English.

Thinking that their vote would not make a difference is quite true in some cases even if the rest of us enjoy and encourage civic participation for its own sake: "[E]ven a smart and hardworking person can rationally decide not to pay much attention to politics. No matter how well-informed a person is, his or her vote has only a tiny chance of affecting the outcome of an election."<sup>5</sup>

Only 4 percent of individuals reported not registering to vote because they did "not know where or how to register." This may be true, or it could be a convenient excuse for many who are too embarrassed to tell a pollster the truth given how easy it is to register by mail, at the many locations where registration is available such as libraries and numerous government offices and agencies, or (in many states) by using the Internet.

- 
1. George F. Will, *Mandatory Voting: Is This the Obama Administration's Goal?* INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY, DEC. 18, 2012, available at <http://news.investors.com/ibd-editorials-on-the-right/121812-637540-no-evidence-automatic-voter-registration-needed.htm?p=full>.
  2. The Brennan Center's first paper on this concept in 2008 was entitled "Universal Voter Registration." In 2009, the Center issued an almost identical paper in which the title had been changed to "Voter Registration Modernization." Apparently, "modernization" was believed to be a better term than "universal" for advocacy on this issue. The latest reissue of this paper, "The Case for Voter Registration Modernization," appeared in 2013 and keeps the modernization language.
  3. FairVote, *7 Ways to Universal Voter Registration*, <http://www.fairvote.org/7-ways-to-universal-voter-registration>.
  4. U.S. CENSUS BUREAU, VOTING AND REGISTRATION IN THE ELECTION OF NOVEMBER 2008, TABLE 6 (2012), available at [HTTP://WWW.CENSUS.GOV/PROD/2010PUBS/P20-562.PDF](http://www.census.gov/prod/2010pubs/P20-562.pdf). Since this is a survey of registration and turnout as reported by voters, it may vary from actual registration and turnout reported by state election officials.
  5. Ilya Somin, *Are American Voters Stupid? Maybe Not*, SOUTH CHINA MORNING POST, SEPT. 27, 2004, available at [HTTP://WWW.CATO.ORG/PUBLICATIONS/COMMENTARY/ARE-AMERICAN-VOTERS-STUPID-MAYBE-NOT](http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/are-american-voters-stupid-maybe-not).

The Census Bureau's 2010 report indicates similar results.<sup>6</sup> Only 3.3 percent of individuals reported not voting because of supposed registration difficulties. Given the tendency of many people not to take responsibility for their own failings or perceived failings, the actual number of people who did not vote because of registration difficulties may be even smaller. The overwhelming majority of those who did not vote said they were not interested (16 percent); were too busy (27 percent); forgot to vote (8 percent); did not like the candidates or the campaign issues (9 percent); or had various other reasons.<sup>7</sup>

**Registration problems do not disproportionately affect minorities and low-income citizens.** Among the tiny percentage of voters who said they did not vote because of "registration problems," there was also almost no racial differential. For instance, the percentage of whites who claimed they did not vote because of a registration problem was 3.2 percent, compared to 3.3 percent of blacks and only 2.8 percent of Hispanics.

There is little evidence to support the oft-repeated assertion that "voter-initiated registration" has a "disproportionate impact on low-income citizens and those who are less educated."<sup>8</sup> In fact, the Census surveys show otherwise. For example, in 2008, the percentage of registered voters who did not vote because of "registration problems" was 6 percent; among voters with a bachelor's degree or more, the percentage was 7.4 percent compared to only 3.2 percent for those with an educational attainment of "less than high school graduate." Furthermore, those attaining "high school graduate or GED" had a rate of 5.8 percent.

The Census survey, in other words, actually demonstrated that less-educated voters had fewer registration problems. The 2010 survey reported similar results for those who did not vote due to registration problems: less than high school, 2.5 percent; high school graduate, 2.6 percent; bachelor's degree or more, 4.3 percent.

With regard to income, the 2010 Census survey demonstrated no discernible "disproportionate

impact." For example, the percentage of voters with a family income of \$100,000 to \$149,000 who did not vote because of purported registration problems was 3.5 percent; the percentage of those with an income of \$15,000 to \$19,999 who claimed registration problems was only 1.9 percent; and the percentage of voters with an income of \$10,000 to \$14,999 who supposedly had registration problems was 2.8 percent, just slightly more than the 2.6 percent reported by individuals making more than \$150,000.

**The claim that "the single greatest cause of voting problems in the United States" is the voter registration system is false. The greatest causes of individuals not registering and not voting are their lack of interest in politics and candidates and other reasons that have nothing whatsoever to do with registration or lack of registration.**

Thus, according to the federal government's own surveys, the claim that "the single greatest cause of voting problems in the United States"<sup>9</sup> is the voter registration system is false. The greatest causes of individuals not registering and not voting are their lack of interest in politics and candidates and other reasons that have nothing whatsoever to do with registration or lack of registration.

**Experience with the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 shows that voter registration is not a barrier to voting.** The push to pass the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) of 1993 was based on the same, similarly flawed premise: that voter registration is a barrier to voting. Before its implementation, "many researchers were optimistic about NVRA's projected impact on voter turnout"; but while the act "did lead to millions of

6. U.S. Census Bureau, *VOTING AND REGISTRATION IN THE ELECTION OF NOVEMBER 2010—DETAILED TABLES* (OCT. 2011), <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/socdemo/voting/publications/p20/2010/tables.html>.

7. *Id.* at Table 10.

8. WENDY WEISER ET AL., BRENNAN CTR. FOR JUSTICE, *VOTER REGISTRATION MODERNIZATION* (2009), available at <http://www.brennancenter.org/page/-/publications/VRM.Proposal.2008.pdf>.

9. *Id.* at 1.

new registered voters,” it apparently made “no significant change in voter turnout.”<sup>10</sup> In other words, the NVRA only led to an increase in the number of registered voters who do not vote.

Other researchers point out that overall registration levels have not increased substantially since passage of the NVRA. The Census Bureau’s 2008 report shows that the reported voter registration rate in 1996—three years after the NVRA became law—was 70.9 percent. The reported registration rate in 2008 was 71 percent—an increase of only one-tenth of 1 percent after the NVRA had been in effect for 15 years.<sup>11</sup> In 2008, the highest level of turnout according to the Census Bureau was among non-Hispanic Whites (66 percent) and blacks (65 percent); turnout among Asians was 48 percent, and turnout among Hispanics was 50 percent.<sup>12</sup>

The experience with the NVRA shows the basic flaw in the underlying assumptions that led to its passage: that registration “barriers” were somehow the reason for the claimed decline in voter turnout. Research shows “that the motivation to vote is especially internal: people register because they *plan* to vote. Therefore people who are registered are very *likely* to vote. However, people who have no interest in voting do not register to vote.”<sup>13</sup>

One detailed study of nonvoters concluded that it is “[a]nother misconception about nonvoters...that they would vote if only the [registration] process was easier.”<sup>14</sup> The study concluded that the reason people do not vote is because for many of them, “voting is neither duty nor ritual.” They are not interested in politics, or are cynical about its outcomes, or do not believe their votes will make a difference (public choice scholarship confirms that such cynicism is often well-founded).

In other words, there are “competing strains of alienation and complacency” among the ranks of nonvoters.<sup>15</sup> Consequently, electoral reforms—“such as easing voter registration through motor-voter

legislation, same-day registration, or uncoupling registration from jury duty—have had, at best, a negligible net effect on voter participation.”<sup>16</sup> Those with greater faith in government’s efficiency and efficacy may be more optimistic about its ability to have a positive impact on American’s lives. In the long run, however, that faith may do more to undermine civic virtue than a healthy cynicism about government bureaucracy.

### MVR’s Numerous Practical Problems

Various recommendations made for a federally imposed, national mandate would *require* states and local governments to:

- Use existing state and federal government databases to automatically (and permanently) register all citizens to vote.
- Create an overriding policy to ensure that voters left off the rolls can register and vote on Election Day.
- Require U.S. citizens to register to vote when completing taxes or actively opt out of the process.
- Tie Post Office change-of-address forms to the voter registration database.
- Require state or local governments to send every residence a notice of those registered at that location; residents could then make changes as needed and return the updated form.
- Provide every U.S. citizen upon birth or naturalization a voter registration number similar to a Social Security number, to be used in all elections and activated when a voter turns 18.<sup>17</sup>

10. Jason Marisam, *Voter Turnout: From Cost to Cooperation*, 21 ST. THOMAS L.R. 190, 202–03 (2008).

11. U.S. CENSUS BUREAU, *supra* note 4, at Table 1.

12. *Id.* at Table 2.

13. Randall D. Lloyd, *Motor Voter: A Dismal Failure*, NEVADA JOURNAL (Feb. 1999), available at <http://nj.npri.org/nj99/02/vote.htm>.

14. JACK C. DOPPELT & ELLEN SHEARER, NONVOTERS: AMERICA’S NO-SHOWS 214 (1999).

15. *Id.* at 220.

16. *Id.* at 219.

17. FairVote, *supra* note 3; see also WEISER, *supra* note 8.

Some of the groundwork for these proposals and federalization of the voter registration process was laid at a Senate Rules Committee hearing by Senator Charles E. Schumer (D-NY) on March 11, 2009.<sup>18</sup> Senator Schumer advocated overhauling America's voter registration system in favor of the "Voter Registration Modernization" proposal from the Brennan Center.<sup>19</sup> This proposal shifts the responsibility of voter registration from the individual to the government, leading to the erosion of distinctions between state and federal responsibilities in election management and the responsibility of individuals to take the steps required to participate in the election process.

The push for mandatory voter registration has accelerated recently. In December 2012, a month after the November election, the leaders of more than three dozen liberal advocacy groups met in Washington for an off-the-record meeting (though covered by *Mother Jones* in some detail) to plan strategy on election-related issues. One of the top three goals was mandating "voter registration modernization" and same-day voter registration; at the same time, one of the other goals agreed on was to oppose any efforts to improve election integrity through voter identification and proof-of-citizenship requirements.<sup>20</sup>

At a speech in Boston on December 11, 2012, Attorney General Eric Holder voiced the Obama Administration's support for automatic registration.<sup>21</sup> The head of the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division, Thomas Perez, said on November 16, 2012, that "all eligible citizens can and should be automatically registered to vote" based on compiling "from databases that already exist." Perez also

claimed that one of the "biggest barriers to voting in the country today is our antiquated registration system."<sup>22</sup> The Brennan Center's 2008 proposal was relaunched in January 2013 when the Brennan Center issued another report on "voter registration modernization," and on January 23, 2013, Representative John Lewis (D-GA) introduced the Voter Empowerment Act (VEA).<sup>23</sup>

These mandates involve numerous practical difficulties. The most common proposal—for states to use existing government databases "to build"<sup>24</sup> their voter rolls—presents several immediate problems.

*First*, many government databases may lack a signature, which is required for voter registration and essential for verifying both petitions for candidates and ballot initiatives, as well as requests for absentee ballots and voted absentee ballots that are received by election officials.

---

## As an enormous unfunded mandate on the states, these proposals would prove costly: a diversion of limited government resources for little to no appreciable increase in voter participation rates.

---

*Second*, using government databases such as "motor vehicle departments, income tax authorities, and social service agencies," as recommended by the Brennan Center, would fail to differentiate citizens from non-citizens. All states, for example,

---

18. *Voter Registration: Assessing Current Problems: Hearing Before the S. Comm. on Rules & Admin.*, 112th Cong. (2009) (statement of Sen. Schumer, Chairman, S. Comm. on Rules & Admin.), available at [http://www.rules.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?p=CommitteeHearings&ContentRecord\\_id=c33b5ae8-ae8-413e-85db-a256ce6169f6&Statement\\_id=f96f308a-48ab-4f47-affa-969a8e28aac3&ContentType\\_id=14f995b9-dfa5-407a-9d35-56cc7152a7ed&Group\\_id=1983a2a8-4fc3-4062-a50e-7997351c154b&MonthDisplay=3&YearDisplay=2009](http://www.rules.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?p=CommitteeHearings&ContentRecord_id=c33b5ae8-ae8-413e-85db-a256ce6169f6&Statement_id=f96f308a-48ab-4f47-affa-969a8e28aac3&ContentType_id=14f995b9-dfa5-407a-9d35-56cc7152a7ed&Group_id=1983a2a8-4fc3-4062-a50e-7997351c154b&MonthDisplay=3&YearDisplay=2009).

19. WENDY WEISER ET AL., BRENNAN CTR. FOR JUSTICE, UNIVERSAL VOTER REGISTRATION (2008), available at [http://brennan.3cdn.net/9bd05fbb9b75fc4cc8\\_lom6bnevg.pdf](http://brennan.3cdn.net/9bd05fbb9b75fc4cc8_lom6bnevg.pdf); Weiser, *supra* note 8.

20. Andy Kroll, *Revealed: The Massive New Liberal Plan to Remake American Politics*, MOTHER JONES (JAN. 9, 2013), <http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2013/01/democracy-initiative-campaign-finance-filibuster-sierra-club-greenpeace-naacp>.

21. Scott Malone & David Ingram, *U.S. Should Automatically Register Voters: Attorney General*, REUTERS (DEC. 12, 2012), <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/12/12/us-usa-vote-holder-idUSBRE8BA1EN20121212>.

22. Thomas Perez, Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, Address at the George Washington University Law School Symposium (Nov. 16, 2012), available at <http://www.justice.gov/crt/opa/pr/speeches/2012/crt-speech-121116.html>.

23. H.R. 12 is also cosponsored by Reps. Steny Hoyer (D-MD), James Clyburn (D-SC), John Conyers (D-MI), and Robert Brady (D-PA).

24. WEISER, *supra* note 8 at 8.



provide driver's licenses to aliens who are legally in the United States, and several states provide driver's licenses to illegal aliens. Many individuals who reside in the United States but are not citizens also file tax returns, which would allow individuals who filed with "income tax authorities" the ability to register to vote. It would also lead to duplicate and multiple registrations of individuals listed on different government databases, such as individuals who own property or pay taxes in more than one state.

*Third*, as an enormous unfunded mandate on the states, these proposals would prove costly: a diversion of limited government resources for little to no appreciable increase in voter participation rates.

In addition to DMV, social service, and income tax agencies, the VEA would require automatic registration of individuals from state agencies that pro-

---

**State registration lists are transparent—such lists are available to candidates, political parties, and the public—but federal databases lack such transparency, and election officials and the public therefore cannot verify the accuracy of such lists.**

---

vide benefits under Title III of the Social Security Act, that maintain records on students enrolled at secondary schools, that are responsible for administering criminal convictions, or that determine mental competence. Additionally, automatic registration would be required from the federal offices of the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Bureau, the Social Security Administration, the Federal Bureau of Prisons, the U.S. Probation Service, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Defense Manpower Data Center of the Department

of Defense, and the Indian Health Services and Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services of the Department of Health and Human Services.

No transaction with any such agency could be completed "until the individual has indicated whether he or she wishes to register to vote." Every time an individual applied for services or assistance, and "with each recertification, renewal, or change of address relating to such services or assistance," the agency would have to ask the individual about registering to vote and could not provide any requested service or assistance until the registration issue had been addressed.<sup>25</sup>

**Proponents of mandatory registration from government databases oppose even limited use of such databases to maintain accurate voter rolls.** It is rather ironic that many of the organizations pushing for automatic registration of individuals based on government databases oppose states' attempts to verify the citizenship, identity, and accuracy of the information provided by individuals registering to vote by comparing them to other government databases.<sup>26</sup> In 2007, for example, the Brennan Center, along with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and the Advancement Project, sued Florida for running database comparisons on registered voters' information with "the state driver's license database or the Social Security Administration's database."<sup>27</sup> In a related press release, the Brennan Center complained about "common database errors" and opposed matching as "an error-laden practice."<sup>28</sup>

Furthermore, in 2006, the Brennan Center and other so-called civil rights organizations sued the state of Washington, claiming that attempting to match voter registration information with other government databases violated the Voting Rights Act and the U.S. Constitution and would disenfranchise voters.<sup>29</sup> In fact, the Brennan Center issued a report in 2006 complaining about the supposedly

---

25. Voter Empowerment Act of 2013, H.R. 12, 113th Cong., § 111 (2013).

26. See, e.g., *Arcia v. Detzner*, -- F.Supp.2d --, 2012 WL 6212564 (S.D. Fla. 2012).

27. *Florida State Conference of NAACP v. Browning*, 522 F.3d 1153, 1155 (11th Cir. 2008).

28. Press Release, BerlinRosen Public Affairs, Voting Rights Advocates Challenge Florida Registration Law in Federal Court (Sept. 17, 2007).

29. *Washington Ass'n of Churches v. Reed*, 492 F.Supp.2d 1264 (W.D. Wash. 2006).



“wide variety of common database matching errors” caused by “data entry” mistakes.<sup>30</sup> Yet the Center now wants to use those same supposedly inaccurate databases to register voters automatically.

As Colorado Secretary of State Scott Gessler pointed out during a January 2013 discussion at The Heritage Foundation, there is no question that there are inaccuracies in state voter registration rolls. However, federal databases are also riddled with errors that may eclipse inconsistencies at the state level. It is important to note that state registration lists are transparent—such lists are available to candidates, political parties, and the public—but federal databases lack such transparency, and election officials and the public therefore cannot verify the accuracy of such lists.

Gessler has witnessed many inaccuracies in Social Security Administration information as well as the National Change of Address (NCOA) database used by the U.S. Postal Service. For example, the NCOA reports a move only if an individual informs the Postal Service of a move. Errors can also occur if the NCOA database classifies everyone at a particular address as having moved when only one person in the household has moved. Gessler believes these federal databases are valuable when they are being used by states to check the information contained in state voter registration lists, since any discrepancy can be researched and corrections made, but to use federal information to automatically register individuals to vote would be to court disaster.

The Brennan Center says that many of these government databases “already include all the information necessary to determine voter eligibility, and those that do not can easily be modified to include that information.”<sup>31</sup> However, as just one example, many of these databases do not contain citizenship information—a basic requirement for eligibility to vote. Organizations such as the Brennan Center have opposed states requiring proof of citizenship from registrants that would provide “that information.”

Even worse, in 2012, a number of civil rights organizations and the Department of Justice sued Florida in an unsuccessful attempt to stop the state’s verification of citizenship status through database comparisons.<sup>32</sup> Florida had to sue the federal government to get access to Department of Homeland Security (DHS) immigration databases to which it is entitled under federal immigration law to get citizenship information. DHS has also fought states through administrative measures, such as using bureaucratic red tape to prevent states from accessing its own databases—something Secretary Gessler experienced firsthand in Colorado.

As the trail of litigation makes clear, these organizations would fight any implementation of an automatic registration program that would allow states first to compare the information in one database with the information in other state and federal databases to ensure that the information is accurate and that only eligible individuals are being registered.

**MVR makes maintenance of existing registration lists even more difficult.** The VEA introduced by Representative Lewis would make it difficult—even more so than it already is—for states to maintain accurate voter registration lists. For example, the legislation would amend the NVRA to *prevent* states from requiring further documentation of new registrants—documentation, such as proof of citizenship, that might be needed to determine eligibility. Section 104 of the bill requires states to register anyone who has provided the state with a “valid voter registration form” that has been “completed” and “attested” by the applicant. The bill also prohibits the “transfer” of information from “the computerized Statewide voter registration list to any source agency.”<sup>33</sup> Election officials would not even be allowed to retain the “identity of the specific source agency through which an individual consented to register to vote” after the individual is added to the statewide voter registration list.<sup>34</sup>

Consequently, if election officials later determined that registration information was inaccurate

30. JUSTIN LEVITT ET AL., BRENNAN CTR. FOR JUSTICE, MAKING THE LIST: DATABASE MATCHING AND VERIFICATION PROCESSES FOR VOTER REGISTRATION (MAY 24, 2006), available at [http://brennan.3cdn.net/96ee05284dfb6a6d5d\\_j4m6b1cjs.pdf](http://brennan.3cdn.net/96ee05284dfb6a6d5d_j4m6b1cjs.pdf).

31. WEISER, *supra* note 8.

32. *United States v. Florida*, 870 F.Supp.2d 1346 (N.D. Fla. June 28, 2012); *Arcia*, 2012 WL 6212564.

33. Voter Empowerment Act of 2013 § 112(b)(3).

34. *Id.* § 112(d).

or even fraudulent, they would be *unable to notify whatever state or federal agency provided them with information on that registrant*, making it impossible for the source agencies to investigate possible fraud in the state and federal programs they are responsible for administering. Lewis's bill would even give noncitizens a get-out-of-jail-free card: It provides that any ineligible individual who becomes registered to vote "shall not be subject to any penalty" for registering "including the imposition of a fine or term of imprisonment, adverse treatment in any immigration or naturalization proceeding, or the denial of any status under immigration laws."<sup>35</sup> In fact, government officials would be prohibited from using "the information received by" election officials "to attempt to determine the citizenship status of any individual for immigration enforcement."<sup>36</sup>

The Lewis bill also prohibits comparison of voter registration information "with any existing commercial list or database" at the risk of imprisonment for not more than one year and subject to fines.<sup>37</sup> Many commercial databases are *more* accurate than government databases. There is no reason for such a prohibition—let alone such criminal penalties—other than to remove a valuable tool that could otherwise be used by state officials to deter fraud.

Supporters of a federal mandate for automatic and same-day registration rarely, if ever, mention that Canada has had such a system in place since 1997. This registration system is administered by Elections Canada, which is responsible for conducting all federal elections and referenda. The United States, for a number of good reasons, has no such equivalent federal agency, but one is particularly relevant to the current registration debate: America's system of dual sovereignty is constitutionally guaranteed, and elections traditionally have been administered by the states. Canadians

are automatically registered from a host of government databases similar to those proposed in the VEA, including the Canada Revenue Agency, Citizenship and Immigration Canada, National Defense, provincial and territorial driver's license and vital statistics agencies, and provincial electoral agencies.<sup>38</sup> (Canadians can also still register and vote on Election Day.)

Yet Canada's automatic registration system has had no effect in increasing turnout. Even before the implementation of Canada's new system in 1997, Canadians voted in larger numbers than Americans, but Canada has still seen a steady *decline* in turnout since the 1970s.<sup>39</sup>

The reasons that Canadian voters who have been automatically registered by the government give for not voting are similar to justifications given by U.S. voters: 28 percent were not interested; 23 percent were too busy; and the rest said "they were out of town, ill or didn't like any of the candidates."<sup>40</sup> Automatic voter registration is no panacea for declining turnout or the unwillingness of individuals to participate in the voting process. Thus, it seems clear that Canada's approach would cause considerable mischief in America's state-administered election system while providing no benefit in terms of voter turnout.

**MVR raises serious privacy concerns.** Requiring individuals who would not register on their own to "opt-out" from registration" if they want "to remain unregistered for whatever reason"<sup>41</sup> interferes with the basic right of individuals to decide whether—and to what extent—to participate in the political and democratic process. While society might hope that all citizens will vote, each and every American has the liberty not to do so for whatever reason. Americans who choose not to vote should not have to act every time they make a

35. *Id.* § 112(d) and §112(f)(1) (although this section does not "waive the liability of any individual who knowingly provides false information to any person regarding the individual's eligibility").

36. *Id.* § 112(f)(2).

37. *Id.* § 112(j) and (k).

38. See Elections Canada, <http://www.elections.ca>.

39. Conference Board of Canada, *How Canada Performs: Voter Turnout*, <http://www.conferenceboard.ca/hcp/details/society/voter-turnout.aspx?pf=true>.

40. John Ibbitson, *The Alarming Decline in Voter Turnout*, THE GLOBE & MAIL (Oct. 14, 2011), <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/the-alarming-decline-in-voter-turnout/article4247507/>.

41. WEISER *supra* note, 8 at 9.

transaction with a government agency to avoid registration or to remove themselves from a government list that they had no interest in joining in the first place, particularly if it involves investigation of their citizenship, felon status, and other factors that are important to eligibility.

Even if individuals can ask to be removed from the registration list after the database information has been transferred to election officials, such automatic registration raises serious privacy concerns. Voter registration lists are public documents that are (and should be) accessible to journalists, candidates, political parties, and individual citizens. In fact, this transparency is an important component of our election process since these lists are often bought by candidates and political parties for the purposes of identifying voters for political campaigns and organizing get-out-the-vote programs for Election Day.

In contrast, not only are state governments obligated to keep the information in many types of other databases maintained by government agencies private, but information on individuals such as police officers, government officials, or victims of domestic violence must be kept confidential. Automatic voter registration could reveal information such as residential addresses, thereby violating the privacy of individuals who have registered for various other types of government benefits. The VEA does require that such information be kept confidential, but that may be very difficult for election officials to do when they are receiving large amounts of information on hundreds of thousands of individuals from other government databases. The source agencies, which may otherwise be required by law to keep all of their client information confidential, may not be aware that certain clients are police officers or victims of domestic violence—individuals with specific privacy requirements.

### **A Slippery Slope: Permanent Registration**

The Brennan Center and others are also proposing that the federal government require states to institute statewide permanent registration. This requirement would mandate that “once a voter is on the rolls, she would be permanently registered within the state and able to vote without re-registering even if she moved within the state or changed her name.”<sup>42</sup>

Already, the National Voter Registration Act has curtailed states’ ability to clean up bloated voter registration rolls by removing ineligible voters who have moved or died. Making registrations permanent would exacerbate this problem. In fact, many states became so fearful of lawsuits by the Justice Department to enforce these NVRA restrictions that they simply stopped maintaining the integrity of their voter registration rolls.

---

### **The U.S. Postal Service’s NCOA is supposedly so inaccurate that liberal civil rights organizations have objected to its use by private parties trying to investigate the validity of voter registrations.**

---

Citizens have a responsibility to inform state election officials when they change their residence or become ineligible to vote for other reasons, such as being convicted of a felony. Notifying election officials of a change of address within a state is especially important because election officials estimate the number of ballots needed at a polling place based on the number of registered voters and past turnout. Allowing individuals who are registered elsewhere in a state but who failed to notify election officials of their move to vote at a new precinct would undermine election officials’ ability both to estimate how many ballots are needed and to ensure a smooth voting experience without long lines. Indeed, underestimating the number of ballots needed or the number of voters expected at a given precinct makes it more likely that some voters will be disenfranchised.

Furthermore, the proposal on permanency would require government agencies like state Departments of Motor Vehicles, the Social Security Administration, or the Post Office to provide updated address information to election officials in order to change the registration addresses of registered voters. Again, such a proposal smacks of hypocrisy: The U.S. Postal Service’s NCOA is supposedly so inaccurate that liberal civil rights organizations have objected to its use by private parties trying to investigate the validity of voter registrations.

---

42. WEISER, *supra* note 8, at 10.

**“Vote Caging.”** These groups even have coined a term—“vote caging”—to describe this practice. Specifically, they claim that private parties’ use of the U.S. Postal Service’s practice of returning non-forwardable mail to challenge the eligibility of voters constitutes voter suppression even if its records show that the individual no longer resides at the registered address.<sup>43</sup> Indeed, a number of bills have been sponsored in Congress that would make reliance on the U.S. Postal Service’s mail service in this manner a federal offense. Not surprisingly, Section 301 of Representative Lewis’s VEA would prohibit such “vote caging.” If the NCOA database is so inaccurate, why are some suggesting that it be used to pad the voter rolls?

The real problem with such a system is that without a unique identifier, it would be very difficult to match many of these records.<sup>44</sup> The only such unique identifier is a Social Security number. Only a handful of states require that an individual registering to vote provide a Social Security number, and these states, such as Virginia, are allowed to do so only because they were grandfathered into the federal Privacy Act of 1974, which restricts the use of Social Security numbers. Any states that did not require a Social Security number to register when that act was passed cannot implement such a requirement today.<sup>45</sup> When the Help America Vote Act of 2002 was being debated in Congress, a proposal to allow all states to require a full Social Security number from new voter registrants was defeated.

The proposal to provide every U.S. citizen upon birth or naturalization a voter registration number similar to a Social Security number, to be used in all elections and activated when a voter turns 18, would require the creation of a new federal bureaucracy. A more logical approach would be simply to amend federal law to allow all states to require that any individual registering to vote must provide his

or her Social Security number. However, in the current political climate, such reform has little chance. Furthermore, political concerns aside, the use of Social Security numbers for voter registration raises valid privacy issues.

To the extent that state voter registration lists can be linked to state DMV records and other state databases, states should—and often do—conduct regular database matching to update registration information as individuals move, die, or become ineligible. But due to the inherent inaccuracies in all such databases, as well as the inability to keep up with all changes in the status of individual voters, states should not be prohibited from removing voters who do not vote in a certain number of federal elections—after they are sent notice of the impending removal. That failure to vote is one indication that a voter has moved or otherwise become ineligible without notifying election officials.

### **Election-Day or Same-Day Registration**

**Election-Day registration is highly vulnerable to organized election fraud.** The proposal for a federally mandated “fail-safe” that would allow anyone to register and vote on Election Day raises constitutional concerns and is poor public policy.<sup>46</sup> Indeed, such policy is a prescription for fraud,

Allowing a voter to both register and vote on Election Day makes it nearly impossible to prevent duplicate votes in different areas or to verify the accuracy of any information provided by a voter. Election officials are unable to check the authenticity of a registration or the eligibility and qualifications of a registrant by comparing the registration information to other state and federal databases that provide information not just on identity, but also on citizenship status and whether the individual in question is a felon whose voting rights have been suspended. Since Election Day registrants cast

43. Project Vote, *Voter Caging*, <http://projectvote.org/voter-caging.html>.

44. Additionally, a change of mailing address does not always mean that an individual has changed his or her residential address for residency and voting purposes.

45. See 5 U.S.C. § 552(a) note (Disclosure of Social Security number); see also *Schwier v. Cox*, 340 F.3d 1284 (11th Cir. 2003).

46. Voter Empowerment Act of 2013 § 121. Currently, eight states (Idaho, Iowa, Maine, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, Wisconsin, and Wyoming) and the District of Columbia allow Election Day registration. Two additional states have passed Election Day legislation; Connecticut’s new law will take effect on July 1, 2013, and California’s law will take effect on January 1 of the year following the year the secretary of state certifies that the state has a statewide voter registration system that complies with the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (no sooner than January 2014). National Conference of State Legislatures, *Same Day Registration*, <http://www.ncsl.org/legislatures-elections/elections/same-day-registration.aspx>.

a regular ballot, even if election officials determine that the registration was invalid after the election, they have no means of discounting the ballot.

For those states entering into cooperative agreements to compare their voter registration lists to identify individuals registered in more than one state, same-day registration would also eliminate that safeguard. In fact, many of the same organizations that are proposing this type of “fail-safe” have vigorously fought Wisconsin’s effort to begin providing some verification of Election Day registrants by requiring such individuals to show a photo ID. After a comprehensive investigation of voter fraud in the 2004 election, the Milwaukee Police Department concluded that the “one thing that could eliminate a large percentage of fraud or the appearance of fraudulent voting in any given Election is the elimination of the On-Site or Same-Day voter registration system.”<sup>47</sup>

In 1986, voters in Oregon got rid of same-day registration after the Rajneeshee cult tried to take over a local county by not only engineering a bioterrorist attack using salmonella to sicken hundreds of residents (and potential voters), but also planning to bring in large numbers of nonresidents (many of them homeless) on Election Day to flood the polls with ineligible voters. As Kansas Secretary of State Kris Kobach said at The Heritage Foundation in January 2013, double voting becomes almost impossible to stop with same-day registration. Voters can just make up names and false addresses and go from polling place to polling place to vote. Kobach was not aware of any state where the registration system is so automated that the temporary poll workers who staff precincts on Election Day could check the identities and residential addresses of instant voters against other state databases. Election Day registration invites fraud.

**Election-Day registration is not likely to increase voter participation or turnout.** Most important, however, is that what some call

“convenience voting,” which includes “mail voting, no excuse absentee voting, early voting and even election-day registration,” may actually hurt turnout.<sup>48</sup> The general election voter turnout in 2008 was the highest in a presidential election since 1960. However, an American University study reported that of “the 12 states which had turnout declines in 2008 as compared to 2004, 10 had some form of convenience voting. Of the 13 states which had the greatest increases in turnout, seven had none of the forms of convenience voting.”<sup>49</sup> In fact, four of the eight states with Election Day registration reported *lower* turnout in 2008, when turnout generally went up in the rest of the country, than they had reported in 2004. The state with the largest decrease in turnout in 2008 was Maine (minus 3.6 percentage points), which also has Election Day registration.

---

**Pouring huge amounts of information, much of it full of errors and mistakes, from federal databases into state voter registration databases would only make the current problems exponentially worse. States are solving the problems that exist in registration lists; additional federal bureaucracy will not help.**

---

Similarly, a study by the Maine Heritage Policy Center found that Election Day registration in Maine had “had no recognizable impact on voter turnout” since its implementation in 1973. In fact, the three election years in which Maine had its “lowest turnout years since 1960 occurred after EDR was implemented.”<sup>50</sup> Nationwide, turnout in the 2012 election was generally down from 2008, dropping a little

---

47. MILWAUKEE POLICE DEPT., REPORT OF THE INVESTIGATION INTO THE NOVEMBER 2, 2004, GENERAL ELECTION IN THE CITY OF MILWAUKEE 26 (2008), available at [http://media2.620wtmj.com/breakingnews/ElectionResults\\_2004\\_VoterFraudInvestigation\\_MPD-SIU-A2474926.pdf](http://media2.620wtmj.com/breakingnews/ElectionResults_2004_VoterFraudInvestigation_MPD-SIU-A2474926.pdf).

48. American University News, African-Americans, Anger, Fear and Youth Propel Turnout to Highest Level Since 1960, 14 (Dec. 17, 2008), available at <http://www.american.edu/research/news/loader.cfm?csModule=security/getfile&pageid=23907>.

49. *Id.*

50. MAINE HERITAGE POLICY CTR., PROTECTING THE INTEGRITY OF MAINE’S ELECTIONS: ELECTION-DAY REGISTRATION IN MAINE 4 (2011), available at <http://www.mainepolicy.org/wp-content/uploads/The-Maine-View-Same-Day-Voter-Registration-100511.pdf>.



over 5 percentage points, yet the turnout in Maine went down over 8 percentage points.<sup>51</sup>

Curtis Gans of the Center for the Study of the American Electorate has concluded that states that adopt “convenience voting” reforms “have a worse performance in the aggregate than those which do not.” The only temporary exception is for Election Day registration, which apparently helps turnout only “in its initial application and for a few elections thereafter.” In fact, in election years where turnout generally increases, “the increase in states with convenience voting” is smaller than the increase in those states that have not adopted such measures, while “in years of decrease, the decreases in the states [with convenience voting] are greater.”<sup>52</sup>

Election Day registration, particularly with its increased risk of ballot fraud, is not the answer to low turnout or registration.

## Alternative Approaches to Registration Reform

**States can help to ensure voting roll accuracy.** There is no question that the U.S voter registration system could be improved. As the Pew Center on the States found, one of every eight registrations in the United States is “no longer valid or [is] significantly inaccurate.”<sup>53</sup> Over 1.8 million deceased voters remain registered, and almost 3 million people are registered in more than one state. However, the answer to these problems is not federal mandates or federal interference in election administration, which should be reserved to the states, consistent with America’s decentralized election administration system.

According to Kansas Secretary of State Kris Kobach, federal mandates would be “completely unworkable” and would “make a mess” of state voter registration databases. States have already begun to implement state-based, bipartisan remedies to voter

registration problems that preserve the balance of power between states and the federal government while maximizing new registration technology in order to ease, rather than remove, an individual’s responsibility to register himself.

For example, Secretary Kobach has initiated the “Interstate Voter Registration Crosscheck Program” to “increase the number of eligible citizens who register to vote” while ensuring “that accurate and current voter registration rolls are maintained.”<sup>54</sup> As of January 10, 2013, 21 states are participating in this program,<sup>55</sup> comparing their voter registration lists to detect multiple registrations (and votes) by the same individual in different states. By the end of 2012, 15 states had compared over 45 million records, turning up hundreds of thousands of potentially duplicate registrations.

For those voters who registered in a new state because they moved but neglected to notify election officials in the state of their former residence, this program gives them an opportunity to correct their registration. For those who intentionally register in more than one state to commit fraud, it helps states to discover violations of the law that threaten the integrity of elections—violations that in the past have been almost impossible to detect. Prosecutions of individuals who were found to have voted in two different states under this program, according to Kobach, have already been initiated.

Similarly, the Pew Center on the States is working on a project with seven states—Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, Nevada, Utah, Virginia, and Washington—to improve the accuracy of voter registration lists and improve voter registration rates. This initiative consists of comparing registration lists with “other data sources to broaden the base of information used to update and verify voter rolls,” using the same proven data-matching techniques developed in private industry “to ensure accuracy and security,” and developing new ways for voters to

51. BIPARTISAN POLICY CTR., 2012 ELECTION TURNOUT DIPS BELOW 2008 AND 2004 LEVELS: NUMBER OF ELIGIBLE VOTERS INCREASES BY EIGHT MILLION, FIVE MILLION FEWER VOTES CAST 2 (2012), available at <http://bipartisanpolicy.org/sites/default/files/2012%20Voter%20Turnout%20Full%20Report.pdf>.

52. American University News, *supra* note 48.

53. PEW CTR. ON THE STATES, INACCURATE, COSTLY, AND INEFFICIENT: EVIDENCE THAT AMERICA’S VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM NEEDS AN UPGRADE 1 (2012), available at [http://www.pewstates.org/uploadedFiles/PCS\\_Assets/2012/Pew\\_Upgrading\\_Voter\\_Registration.pdf](http://www.pewstates.org/uploadedFiles/PCS_Assets/2012/Pew_Upgrading_Voter_Registration.pdf).

54. Kris Kobach, Kansas Secretary of State, Presentation at Meeting of Nat’l Ass’n of State Election Directors (Jan. 26, 2013).

55. Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Tennessee.



submit registration information to “minimize manual data entry” errors.<sup>56</sup>

After a long struggle with the Obama Administration, states such as Florida and Colorado are also starting to gain access to the Department of Homeland Security’s records on aliens in order to check the citizenship status of registered voters. However, as Secretary Gessler noted while speaking at The Heritage Foundation, the DHS records are incomplete and contain errors. While access to the DHS database is needed, such access is no substitute for, or nearly as effective as, requiring individuals registering to vote or voting to provide proof of identity or citizenship as Georgia, Alabama, and Arizona have done.

Pouring huge amounts of information, much of it full of errors and mistakes, from federal databases into state voter registration databases would only make the current problems exponentially worse. States are solving the problems that exist in registration lists; additional federal bureaucracy will not help.

Moreover, the U.S. Election Assistance Commission, created by the Help America Vote Act of 2002, is one of the most dysfunctional agencies in the federal government and does not have the resources, personnel, or knowledge to direct states. These proposals that supposedly are intended to help states improve the accuracy and validity of state voter registration lists could instead sabotage the progress that states are already making.

**States are improving the voter registration process.** The National Voter Registration Act made voter registration easy: It requires voter registration at state DMV, welfare, and disability agencies and military recruitment offices, as well as mandating mail-in registration. Yet states have been initiating new measures to make registration even simpler. States like Colorado, Louisiana, and Georgia have implemented online registration that allows individuals who already have a state driver’s license to register to vote over the Internet. Colorado voters can register using the state’s online voter registration system through their computers, phones, or

tablets. And Louisiana has implemented a smart-phone application that allows voters to access information about their registration, polling location, voting district, and sample ballots.

In 2012, Colorado Secretary of State Gessler sent notices to 700,000 Coloradans who might be eligible to vote but were not yet registered to encourage and help them to register for the upcoming election.<sup>57</sup> By Election Day, Colorado voter registration reached a record level: 440,888 more voters registered than in 2008, a 13.7 percent increase. Colorado’s increase in turnout is even more notable when considering that most of the nation saw a decrease in turnout in 2012 compared to the 2008 election. Secretary Gessler attributes this increase to the deployment of “new technologies and systems such as multi-state data matching, electronic ballot delivery for military and overseas voters, and high-speed Ballot on Demand printers.”<sup>58</sup>

## Conclusion

The federal government and Members of Congress should respect differences among states. America is not homogenous, and one size does not fit all, especially when it comes to issues like voter registration. Citizens in different states have different needs, desires, and values; therefore, it makes little sense for the federal government to micro-manage state voter registration systems. Indeed, the federal government has almost no experience administering elections; states are the experts on voting and, as such, are already implementing new programs and systems to improve the accuracy, effectiveness, and ease of the voter registration process.

Requiring automatic registration from government databases risks the integrity of the election process and improperly shifts the responsibility for registering from the individual to the government. States are already using federalism and their unique responsibilities in the voting process as originally intended: to experiment in the laboratories of democracy. The improvements these states are implementing come at less cost—to our treasury,

---

56. PEW CTR. ON THE STATES, *supra* note 53.

57. Press Release, Scott Gessler, Colorado Secretary of State, Colorado Registers Another Successful Election: Voters Exceed 2008 Turnout (Nov. 9, 2012).

58. COLORADO SECRETARY OF STATE SCOTT GESSLER, 2012 GENERAL ELECTION REVIEW: A COLORADO SUCCESS STORY (FEB. 7, 2013).

our Constitution, and the integrity of our elections—  
than mandatory universal registration.

—*Hans A. von Spakovsky is a Senior Legal Fellow at The Heritage Foundation and a former Commissioner on the Federal Election Commission. He is the coauthor of Who's Counting? How Fraudsters and Bureaucrats Put Your Vote at Risk (Encounter Books, 2012).*



KATE BROWN

SECRETARY OF STATE

JIM WILLIAMS

DIRECTOR

255 CAPITOL STREET NE, SUITE 501  
SALEM, OREGON 97310-0722

(503) 986-1518

BY EMAIL &amp; U.S. MAIL

June 18, 2014

The Honorable Representative Sal Esquivel  
900 Court Street NE, H-483  
Salem, OR 97301  
Rep.SalEsquivel@state.or.us

Representative Esquivel:

Thank you for your questions regarding voter registration and citizenship verification. Your questions, and the issues they raise, have been the focus of ongoing discussions both locally and nationally. The Elections Division of the Secretary of State works closely with the DMV to accomplish the goals of the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) and to make voter registration as accessible as possible to all Oregonians.

I have attempted to answer your specific questions below. However, it is helpful to first provide some background information as an overview. In Oregon, a person may register to vote either with a paper application or online. When online voter registration was developed in Oregon, the online system was designed to mirror the paper process as much as possible. Online voter registration was approved during the 2009 legislative session and launched in March of 2010. At around the same time beginning in 2008, the Oregon DMV began phasing in over several years a legislatively mandated program to require proof of a customer's "legal presence" in the United States—based on documents supplied to the DMV—before issuing, renewing, or replacing any driver license, driver permit, or identification card. The requirements for establishing "legal presence" to obtain a driver license, driver permit, or identification card from DMV, however, do not correspond perfectly in all instances with the citizenship requirements for registering to vote.

Accordingly, voter registration in Oregon – both in paper and online – relies on the citizenship attestation made by a person registering to vote. If the person registering to vote lies on the form about their citizenship (or any other matter), then the person commits a Class C felony and is subject to fines of up to \$125,000 and/or imprisonment for up to 5 years. ORS 260.993(2); ORS 260.715(1); ORS 161.625; ORS 161.605. The crime of perjury is also a Class C felony, with the same penalties as those for lying on a voter registration form. ORS 162.065; ORS 161.625; ORS 161.605

Once a person submits a registration form, either in paper or online, Oregon law gives county clerks the authority to determine "[t]he qualifications of any person who requests to be registered" (ORS 247.174(1)) and to "inquire into the validity of the registration of any elector" (ORS 247.195(1)). In performing their duties, county clerks have limited access to DMV data, which is updated every week.

The DMV data available to county clerks complies with HAVA and Oregon's online voter registration statute, ORS 247.019, which both make driver license data an important part of the voter registration process. HAVA requires that a person who has been issued a current and valid driver license provide his or her driver license number before he or she can be eligible to vote in a federal election. 42. U.S.C. 15483(a)(5)(A). Further, in addition to requiring you to attest to your citizenship, state statute requires

that you have an Oregon driver license, driver permit, or state identification card to use Oregon's online voter registration system. ORS 247.019(1)(a)-(c).

The driver license requirement in both the federal HAVA law and Oregon's online voter registration statute provides county clerks valuable information to confirm a registrant's identity and eligibility to vote. Clerks primarily use DMV data and the driver license number supplied by the applicant to confirm the voter's name, address, date of birth, and to determine whether the person is already registered. In addition, for online registrations, the DMV data is used to obtain the person's signature for later use to verify the voter's signature on the ballot cast during an election.

The DMV data used by county clerks includes all people issued a valid Oregon driver license, driver permit, or state identification card. ORS 247.019(1)(a)-(c). While that data contains valuable information for county clerks, it has three main limitations for verifying the citizenship attestation made on either a paper or online registration form. First, to obtain a valid license, permit, or identification card today and appear in the DMV data, a person must prove with documentation to the DMV that they have a "legal presence" in the United States. ORS 807.021; ORS 807.400. However, as contemplated by statute, "legal presence" for the DMV is not necessarily the same thing as citizenship for purposes of registering to vote.

For instance, when people interact with the DMV, the internal database at DMV is updated including specific codes regarding their "legal presence." One "legal presence" code in the internal DMV database is for people who are known, validated citizens according to the documentation required by the DMV. These validated citizens are coded as "C" in the internal DMV database. For these people, the "legal presence" code of "C" in the internal DMV database can be used to confirm citizenship.

For others in the internal DMV database, however, the "legal presence" coding is less conclusive. For example, the internal DMV database includes a code for "Permanent Residents." These people are coded as "P" in the database and were permanent legal residents, but not citizens, at the time of their last interaction with the DMV. However, as time passes, these permanent residents may have attained actual citizenship, even though they are still listed with a "P" code in the DMV database because that information has not been updated. Further, under Oregon law, a permanent resident who is not yet a citizen can still register to vote so long as they provide sufficient information to a county clerk to prove that they are, in fact, a citizen at the time of the election. ORS 247.015(3). This statute is meant to enfranchise those people who are sworn-in as new citizens before the election but after the 20-day registration cut off. As a result, at the time they attempt to register to vote, a person coded as "P" for Permanent Resident in the DMV database may be:

- (1) A full citizen entitled to register and vote whose entry in the DMV database simply has not been updated after the person attained citizenship;
- (2) A soon-to-be citizen entitled to register under ORS 247.015(3) and subject to a requirement to supply proof of citizenship to the county clerk; or
- (3) A permanent resident who is not a citizen and who is not entitled to vote.

As a result, the "P" designation in the internal DMV database alone does not provide information that is sufficient for a county clerk to confirm or deny citizenship.

Further, for many people in the internal DMV database, there is not yet any code entered to shed any light on their citizenship status. While some people have a “C” code, “P” code, or other discrete code, a number of people have no code at all. This field remains blank because the person has not yet sufficiently interacted with the DMV to supply the data necessary to assign him or her a code in the database. Without a code in the database, there is no data upon which a county clerk may exclude a person from registering to vote, especially when the person has attested that they are a United States citizen under the threat of severe criminal penalties.

The second main limitation of the DMV data concerns timing. Under SB 1080 (2008), the DMV’s verification of “legal presence” and data collection on this topic is being phased in over time, so new license applicants and those required to renew, for example, must supply documents to verify their legal presence. However, if you have a valid license and are not yet required to renew it, then your data in the internal DMV database may not yet reflect any entry for “legal presence.” Since the DMV began phasing in its “legal presence” coding over several years beginning in 2008, online voter registration implemented in 2010 did not automatically screen registrants against the limited DMV database to verify citizenship. Instead, as with the parallel paper registration process, online registrants were required to attest to their citizenship subject to severe criminal penalties. Over time, of course, the internal DMV database is being updated as people apply for or renew their driver licenses.

The third main limitation concerns the information available to clerks when verifying a voter’s eligibility. While the DMV itself has internal codes in its database for “C,” “P,” and other designations, that specific information is not yet available for county clerks to see. Instead, county clerks see that a person has a record in the database, which means that they have a valid driver license, driver permit, or identification card. Clerks, however, cannot see the specific DMV coding for “legal presence.” My office is currently investigating solutions to make this specific DMV coding information available to clerks so they can use it to carry out their responsibilities to determine the qualifications and validity of voter registrations.

Given these limitations, using the DMV data for voter registration purposes must be done carefully. For example, the DMV data can safely be used to rule-in those coded with a “C” as eligible voters for registration purposes. The DMV database, on the other hand, in many instances cannot be reliably used by itself to rule-out people as ineligible to register to vote. For example, those labeled with a “P” may be eligible – or ineligible – to register given their individual situation. Further, for those without any code in the database there is simply no information that could be used to affirmatively exclude them from registering, particularly when they attest to their United States citizenship subject to severe criminal penalties.

In her discussions about Voter Modernization in the 2013 legislative session, Secretary Brown proposed that any effort to streamline voter registration would only focus on confirmed citizens (those coded with a “C” in the DMV database). This was an important added security feature of the Secretary’s Voter Modernization proposal in 2013. It would have provided a higher level of security and gone a step beyond the current statutory framework for online voter registration.

Given the limitations of the DMV database, we are working to compare Oregon’s voter registration database and DMV database with similar databases in other states. In cooperation with the Electronic Registration Information Center (“ERIC”) project, we hope to identify any duplicate registrations, provide updated address information, and identify potentially eligible voters who are currently not

registered to vote. The ERIC project is primarily focused on cleaning up the registration rolls and also engaging eligible but unregistered voters in the process. The ERIC project alone, however, will not provide increased information on citizenship status for those in the DMV database.

With this background in mind, I would like to now address your specific questions.

**Question #1: What procedures does the SOS employ to utilize the information concerning citizenship (or lack thereof) in batch files received from the DMV?**

County clerks use the DMV data to confirm a voter's identity, including their name, address, and date of birth. When a voter registers online or in paper, they are required to submit a driver license number if they have one. That number is checked against the DMV file for a match with the individual's name and date of birth to confirm identity and verify the person's eligibility to register to vote based on their age. At the present time, because the DMV database cannot be used to reliably rule-out people from registering to vote based on the limited coding for "legal presence," the DMV database is not used to automatically screen people based on those codes. Instead, the strict fines and prison terms associated with falsifying a voter registration form serve as the deterrent.

**Question #2: What steps, in terms of legislative, administrative, and funding initiatives, would be required to permit SOS employees to access the DMV database directly to confirm citizenship with respect to newly-received registrations?**

SOS employees currently have the ability to access some DMV data directly. Administratively, however, three things need to occur to safely use the DMV data to exclude people from registering to vote when those people have otherwise attested to their citizenship. First, the DMV will need to develop codes that better capture citizenship information for purposes of excluding them from registering to vote. For example, instead of an inconclusive "P" code for Permanent Residents, the DMV will need to develop codes that better match a person's eligibility to vote. Second, once adequate codes are in place, DMV will need enough time for everybody to cycle through the DMV to update, renew, or obtain a license, at which point the necessary data in the DMV database will be updated. Third, county clerks will need to be given access to see the new "legal presence" coding in the DMV database so they can use it to help verify a person's eligibility to register.

As far as legislative action is concerned, under the existing statutory framework, county clerks have the primary responsibility to determine "the qualifications of any person who requests to be registered" (ORS 247.174(1)) and to "inquire into the validity of the registration of any elector" (ORS 247.195(1)). Legislative action would be required to amend these statutes, and possibly others, to permit SOS employees to confirm citizenship and determine the qualification of registrants and verify the validity of their registration.

**Question #3: What steps, in terms of legislative, administrative, and funding initiatives, would be required to permit the SOS to run its entire voter registration database against the DMV database directly to confirm citizenship with respect to all Oregon voters?**

The SOS could run the entire voter registration database against the DMV database. Indeed, the ERIC project is designed to do this type of data matching. However, given the current limitations in the DMV coding, comparing for citizenship can be done in only a limited fashion. For example, comparing the voter registration database with the DMV database will reveal a number of registered voters who are coded as "C" in the DMV database. These are confirmed citizens because the DMV database



confirms their status as citizens for the purpose of voting. However, the comparison will also likely show a number of valid registered voters who have no “legal presence” code in the database since their information simply is not yet updated in the database. Further, the comparison might show some people coded as “P” for Permanent Residents who are, in fact, eligible to vote because either they have since become citizens or they are soon-to-be citizens entitled to register under ORS 247.015(3). For those without a code, or those coded with a “P,” the data comparison alone cannot be used to determine conclusively that these people are invalidly registered.

**Question #4: What law or rule prevents DMV from sharing the entire SSN with the SOS?**

No law or rule currently prevents the DMV from sharing a customer’s entire SSN with the SOS for voter registration purposes. See ORS 802.195(3) (permitting DMV to “disclose an individual’s Social Security number from a motor vehicle record to the other agency for use in carrying out the other agency’s governmental functions”). However, due to privacy concerns and the requirements of the Help America Vote Act (see 42 USC § 15483(a)(5)(A)), the Oregon Centralized Voter Registration (OCVR) database is designed to only capture and store the last four digits of a voter’s driver license number and/or SSN. Therefore, our current inter-agency agreement calls for only the last four digits of a person’s SSN to be transmitted to the SOS from the DMV.

**Question #5: If such data can only be used by law for “law enforcement or child support purposes,” isn’t maintaining the integrity of voter rolls “law enforcement”?**

Generally speaking, administration of election law and registering people to vote is not considered “law enforcement.” Furthermore, with improvements in technology and processes (such as ERIC) utilization of full SSNs is not necessary. In instances where a person is accused of falsifying information on their voter registration form, then using the full SSN would be seem appropriate for “law enforcement” purposes.

**Question #6: What steps, in terms of legislative, administrative, and funding initiatives, would be required to permit the SOS to modify the Oregon voter registration form to seek satisfactory proof of citizenship?**

Whether states can require proof of citizenship before a person registers to vote is a matter of pending litigation in federal court. In 2013, the United States Supreme Court in *Arizona v. Inter Tribal Council of Arizona, Inc.* ruled that the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) preempted a state law requiring voters to present proof of citizenship because the NVRA mandates a uniform federal registration form that requires only attestation of citizenship. Two states, Arizona and Kansas, then sought to have the federal Election Assistance Commission change the federal form to allow states to require proof of citizenship. The Commission denied the states’ request and the states then sued the Commission in a case called *Kobach v. Election Assistance Commission*. Just this spring in March of 2014, the federal district court in that case agreed with the states that the Commission was required to change the federal form to require proof of citizenship. That decision was appealed, and just last month in May of 2014, the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit issued a stay stopping enforcement of the lower court’s decision until the issue is resolved on appeal.

Given the uncertain and evolving state of federal law on this issue, your best course may be to consult with Legislative Counsel to determine what legislative options are available. Further, since Oregon’s statutes make the verification of a voter’s eligibility a question decided by county clerks, the

administrative and funding burdens would likely fall on the clerks to determine whether satisfactory proof of citizenship was, in fact, provided along with the voter's registration form.

**Question #7: Does the SOS regard the proof requirements established by the DMV as appropriate, and, if not, why not?**

At this point, the DMV's proof requirements are our best source of information regarding citizenship, at least for those people who have been affirmatively coded as "C" in the internal DMV database. Again, while the DMV data is the most reliable source, we know that the data is incomplete or inconclusive regarding the citizenship of certain people in the database.

**Question #8: Will the SOS support legislation to unify the voter and driver citizenship verification processes and require satisfactory proof of citizenship in connection with voter registration?**

At the present time it is difficult to support such legislation given the uncertain and evolving state of federal law on the subject. Once the litigation is concluded, and the legal parameters are clear, the Secretary would be willing to revisit this issue. The Secretary does, however, support using the DMV data to reach out to and engage more Oregonians into the electoral process, and the Secretary believes that those future outreach efforts should be focused on those Oregonians affirmatively coded as "C" in the DMV database. For the time being, however, Oregon state law places the burden on the individual voter to attest to their citizenship under the threat of severe criminal penalties, and the Secretary supports maintaining those penalties under any proposal to amend or modernize Oregon's voter registration process.

Sincerely,

*/s/ Jim Williams*

Jim Williams  
Elections Director