

# ELISE STEFANIK HAS EMBRACED THE ANTI-DEMOCRACY MOVEMENT

## Highlights

- Elise Stefanik supported Donald Trump's efforts to overturn the 2020 election.
  - Stefanik voted to overturn the 2020 election by objecting to Pennsylvania's Electoral College vote count.
  - Stefanik signed onto an amicus brief asking the Supreme Court to overturn the 2020 election results.
  - Stefanik spread misinformation in order to support Trump's efforts to overturn the 2020 election.
- Elise Stefanik would not say Donald Trump was at fault for the January 6 insurrection
  - Stefanik condemned the violence on January 6<sup>th</sup> but would not say Trump was at fault.
  - Stefanik refused to impeach Trump after January 6.
  - Stefanik deflected blame for January 6 to Nancy Pelosi, claiming she failed to act as Speaker of the House.
  - Stefanik introduced a resolution stating that Trump "did not engage in an insurrection."
- Elise Stefanik echoed Donald Trump's sympathies for the January 6 rioters.
  - Stefanik called January 6<sup>th</sup> rioters "hostages," echoing Trump.
- Elise Stefanik would not commit to certifying the 2024 presidential election results.
  - Stefanik said she would not have certified the 2020 presidential election results.
- Elise Stefanik voted against the Freedom to Vote Act, an omnibus bill to strengthen American elections and democracy.
  - The Freedom to Vote Act would have enacted stronger campaign finance guidelines.
  - The Freedom to Vote Act would have empowered watchdogs to crack down on abusing the law while campaigning.
  - The Freedom to Vote Act would have strengthened voting equipment.
  - The Freedom to Vote Act would have made it easier to vote.
  - The Freedom to Vote Act would have strengthened anti-discrimination enforcement under the Voting Rights Act.
  - The Freedom to Vote Act would have protected the right to vote.
  - The Freedom to Vote Act would have made elections and democracy fairer.
- Elise Stefanik voted against efforts to expand voting rights and make ballot access easier.
  - Stefanik voted against an amendment that would have required a study on the 2020 elections and recommendations to support states' improvements to vote-by-mail systems.
  - Stefanik voted against making Election Day a federal holiday.
  - Stefanik voted against an amendment that would have required certain polling locations to stay open for an extended four hours.
  - Stefanik voted against requiring contingency plans to allow voting during a state emergency.
  - Stefanik voted against an amendment that would allow college campuses to serve as polling locations.
- Elise Stefanik voted against efforts to strengthen elections from cybersecurity and foreign threats.
  - Stefanik voted for an amendment that would strike a provision that would protect U.S. democratic institutions from cyberattacks, disinformation, and influence operations.

Stefanik voted against an election security bill to counter foreign interference in American elections.

## Stefanik Supported Trump's Efforts To Overturn The 2020 Election

### STEFANIK VOTED TO OVERTURN THE 2020 ELECTION BY OBJECTING TO PENNSYLVANIA'S ELECTORAL COLLEGE

**2021: Stefanik Voted For Objecting To Pennsylvania's Vote Count From The November 2020 Elections.** In January 2021, according to Congressional Quarterly, Stefanik voted for an "objection to the counting of electoral votes from the state

of Pennsylvania during the joint session of Congress, on the grounds that they were not, under all of the known circumstances, regularly given.” The vote was on agreeing to the objection. The House rejected the motion by a vote of 138-282. [House Vote 11, [1/7/21](#); Congressional Quarterly, [1/7/21](#)]

## **STEFANIK SIGNED ON TO AN AMICUS BRIEF ASKING THE SUPREME COURT TO OVERTURN THE 2020 ELECTION RESULTS**

**Stefanik Onto An Amicus Brief In Texas’ Case Into Voting In the 2020 Election.** According to Stefanik’s press release accessed via the Wayback Machine, “Congresswoman Elise Stefanik has signed onto an amicus brief requesting a lawsuit be brought to the Supreme Court by the Attorney General of Texas. ‘The amicus brief that was signed by over 100 House Republican Members today is about protecting our Constitution,’ said Congresswoman Stefanik. ‘The Constitution is clear; Election Officials and State Executives cannot change the people’s presidential election process without the state legislature approving it. Additionally, it is unconstitutional to refuse to check signatures on mail-in ballots if the state law explicitly states that they must be checked. We are requesting that the Supreme Court carefully review the lawsuit and provide clarity to the American People, who are rightfully concerned about both the unconstitutional overreach from certain state officials and the integrity of the Presidential election.’” [Rep. Elise Stefanik accessed via the Wayback Machine, [12/10/20](#)]

**The Lawsuit Was A Long-Shot Bid To Overturn The 2020 Election Results For Trump.** According to Reuters, “President Donald Trump and 17 U.S. states on Wednesday threw their support behind a long-shot lawsuit by Texas seeking to overturn his election loss by asking the U.S. Supreme Court to throw out the voting results in four states. Trump, defeated by President-elect Joe Biden in the Nov. 3 election, filed a motion with the court asking the nine justices to let him intervene and become a plaintiff in the suit filed on Tuesday by Republican-governed Texas against Georgia, Michigan, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin.” [Reuters, [12/9/20](#)]

## **STEFANIK SPREAD MISINFORMATION TO SUPPORT TRUMP’S EFFORTS TO OVERTURN THE 2020 ELECTION**

### **Stefanik Emphasized Her Support For Arizona’s Election Audit, Which Was Backed By Election Conspiracy Theorists**

**Stefanik Emphasized Her Support For The Arizona Election Audit.** According to the Washington Post, “Appearing on Bannon’s show less than a week before Republicans are expected to vote Cheney out, Stefanik sought to cement her place in leadership by giving credence to unfounded theories about election fraud, including in Arizona. ‘I fully support the audit in Arizona,’ she said. ‘We want transparency and answers for the American people. What are the Democrats so afraid of?’” [Washington Post, [5/6/21](#)]

*The Arizona Election Audit Was Backed By Election Conspiracy Theorists*

### **Arizona Mirror Headline: “Election Conspiracy Theorist Groups Paid \$5.7 Million For The Arizona ‘Audit.’”**

According to the Arizona Mirror, “After months of questions, the leader of the Arizona Senate’s election review released a list of financial contributors, showing the self-styled audit has been funded by organizations that have aggressively promoted baseless conspiracy theories about the 2020 election — and in some cases sought to overturn results. Five groups were responsible for providing more than \$5.7 million, a spokesman for audit team leader Doug Logan announced on Thursday. The America Project, a nonprofit group started by former Overstock.com CEO Patrick Byrne, contributed more than half of the funding, putting in more than \$3.2 million.” [Arizona Mirror, [7/28/21](#)]

### **Stefanik Falsely Claimed That Thousands Of Votes Came From Underage Voters In Fulton County, Georgia**

**Stefanik Claimed That Thousands Of Votes Came From Underage Voters In Fulton County, Georgia.** According to an opinion piece by Stefanik in the Sun Community News, “In Georgia, there was unconstitutional overreach when the Secretary of State unilaterally gutted signature matching for absentee ballots and in essence eliminated voter verification required by state election law. In addition, more than 140,000 votes came from underage, deceased, and otherwise unauthorized voters -- in Fulton County alone. And many individuals testified to not being able to meaningfully observe the counting of ballots.” [Sun Community News, Opinion – Elise Stefanik, [1/6/21](#)]

*Stefanik's Claim That Thousands Of Votes Came From Underage Voters Was Proven False*

**Fulton County Registration And Election Director Richard Barron Called The Allegations “False And Baseless.”** According to Agence France-Presse’s Fact Check, “‘Fulton County is aware of allegations of 132,000 ballots being ‘flagged.’ These claims are simply false and baseless,’ the county’s Registration and Elections Director Richard Barron said in a statement emailed to AFP.” [Agence France-Presse’s Fact Check, [11/11/20](#)]

**Ari Schaffer, A Spokesman For Georgia’s Secretary Of State, Called The Allegations “Ludicrous.”** According to CNN, “‘The Georgia Secretary of State’s office knows the age of everyone who voted because they had to be registered in order to vote, and there were no underage voters,’ Ari Schaffer, spokesman for Republican Georgia Secretary of State Brad Raffensperger, said in a Wednesday email to CNN. ‘Across the state, we found only 2 votes credited to dead voters. The suggestion that one fourth of all ballots cast in Fulton County in November were illegal is ludicrous.’” [CNN, [5/6/21](#)]

### **Stefanik Falsely Claimed Georgia’s Secretary Of State “Eliminated Voter Verification” For Absentee Ballots, Which Was Required By The State**

*Stefanik Said Georgia Secretary Of State Raffensperger Gutted Signature Matching For Absentee Ballots, Which She Said “Eliminated Voter Verification”*

**Stefanik Falsely Claimed Georgia’s Secretary Of State “Eliminated Voter Verification” For Absentee Ballots Which Was Required By The State.** According to Stefanik’s speech accessed via the Wayback Machine, “In Georgia, there was unconstitutional overreach when the Secretary of State unilaterally and unconstitutionally gutted signature matching for absentee ballots and, in [sic] essence, eliminated voter verification required by state election law.” [Rep. Elise Stefanik accessed via the Wayback Machine, [1/6/21](#)]

*Stefanik’s Claim That Raffensperger Got Rid Of Signature Matching For The 2020 Election Was False*

**Georgia Absentee And In-Person Voters Had Their Signatures Verified In The 2020 Election.** According to CNN, “‘What counts as ‘guttled’ is subjective, but Stefanik’s broader claim is clearly incorrect: Raffensperger did not get rid of signature matching for the 2020 election, much less eliminate ‘voter verification’ more broadly – ‘in essence’ or otherwise. Georgia’s absentee voters did have their signatures verified in the 2020 election, and its in-person voters had their photo identification verified.’” [CNN, [5/6/21](#)]

**An Audit Found That The Elections Department In Cobb County Had A “99.99% Accuracy Rate” In Performing Correct Signature Verification Procedures.** According to CNN, “‘A subsequent audit found that the elections department in suburban Cobb County, which Biden won by about 14 percentage points, ‘had a 99.99% accuracy rate in performing correct signature verification procedures.’” [CNN, [5/6/21](#)]

*It Was Assumed Stefanik Was Referring To Raffensperger Settling A Lawsuit Where At Least Three Members Of The County’s Elections Staff Need To Be Involved To Reject An Absentee Ballot Over Signature Issues*

**It Was Assumed Stefanik Was Referring To Raffensperger Previously Settling A Lawsuit Where At Least Three Members Of The County’s Elections Staff Need To Be Involved To Reject An Absentee Ballot Over Signature Issues.** According to CNN, “‘Stefanik was likely referring to a March 2020 legal agreement Raffensperger endorsed to settle a Democratic lawsuit. The agreement said that at least three members of a county elections staff need to be involved in a decision to reject an absentee ballot over a signature matching issue. And it required that, if a rejection does occur, the voter must be quickly contacted so they have a chance to fix the problem.’” [CNN, [5/6/21](#)]

**Raffensperger Claimed That The Percentage Of Georgia’s Absentee Ballots That Were Rejected For Signature Issues Was “Slightly” Higher Than In 2018.** According to CNN, “‘Raffensperger wrote in a January 6 letter to Georgia members of Congress that the percentage of Georgia absentee ballots rejected for signature issues in 2020, 0.22%, was ‘actually slightly higher’ than the 0.2% rate in the 2018 election, before the settlement agreement.’” [CNN, [5/6/21](#)]

### **Stefanik Amplified Baseless Claims About Ballots Being Mishandled In Michigan**

*Stefanik Claimed That Many Individuals In Michigan Signed Affidavits Documenting Alleged “Unconstitutional Irregularities”*

**Stefanik Claimed That Many Individuals In Michigan Signed Affidavits Documenting Alleged “Unconstitutional Irregularities.”** According to an opinion piece by Stefanik in the Sun Community News, “In Michigan, many individuals signed affidavits documenting the unconstitutional irregularities they witnessed – officials physically blocking the legal right of poll watchers to observe vote counts, the counting of late ballots, hand stamping ballots with the previous day’s date, and more. The merits of these illegal, alarming, and reprehensible actions were never considered by a court.” [Sun Community News, Opinion – Elise Stefanik, [1/6/21](#)]

**Stefanik Claimed Individuals Witnessed Election Officials In Michigan Physically Blocking Poll Watchers From Observing The Polls**

**Stefanik Claimed Individuals Witnessed Election Officials In Michigan Physically Blocking Poll Watchers From Observing The Polls.** According to an opinion piece by Stefanik in the Sun Community News, “In Michigan, many individuals signed affidavits documenting the unconstitutional irregularities they witnessed – officials physically blocking the legal right of poll watchers to observe vote counts, the counting of late ballots, hand stamping ballots with the previous day’s date, and more. The merits of these illegal, alarming, and reprehensible actions were never considered by a court.” [Sun Community News, Opinion – Elise Stefanik, [1/6/21](#)]

**Stefanik Claimed Individuals Witnessed Election Officials In Michigan Counting Ballots Late**

**Stefanik Claimed Individuals Witnessed Election Officials In Michigan Counting Ballots Late.** According to an opinion piece by Stefanik in the Sun Community News, “In Michigan, many individuals signed affidavits documenting the unconstitutional irregularities they witnessed – officials physically blocking the legal right of poll watchers to observe vote counts, the counting of late ballots, hand stamping ballots with the previous day’s date, and more. The merits of these illegal, alarming, and reprehensible actions were never considered by a court.” [Sun Community News, Opinion – Elise Stefanik, [1/6/21](#)]

**Stefanik Claimed Individuals Witnessed Election Officials In Michigan Hand Stamping Ballots With The Previous Day’s Date**

**Stefanik Claimed Individuals Witnessed Election Officials In Michigan Hand Stamping Ballots With The Previous Day’s Date.** According to an opinion piece by Stefanik in the Sun Community News, “In Michigan, many individuals signed affidavits documenting the unconstitutional irregularities they witnessed – officials physically blocking the legal right of poll watchers to observe vote counts, the counting of late ballots, hand stamping ballots with the previous day’s date, and more. The merits of these illegal, alarming, and reprehensible actions were never considered by a court.” [Sun Community News, Opinion – Elise Stefanik, [1/6/21](#)]

*The Affidavits Contained No Evidence Of Voter Fraud, Rather Allegations About Ballot-Counting Procedures Which The State Had Already Debunked*

**There Was No Evidence That Michigan Counted Ballots That Arrived After The State’s Deadline.** According to CNN, “There is no evidence that Michigan counted ballots that arrived after the state receipt deadline of 8 p.m. on election night. Though some Republicans claimed that viral images showed someone bringing late-arriving ballots into a counting center in Detroit, those images actually showed a news photographer bringing in camera equipment.” [CNN, [5/6/21](#)]

**Many Of The Michigan Affidavits Contained Claims That Were Debunked Or Revealed A Lack Of Understanding Of How The Ballot Counting Process Worked.** According to CNN, “Many of the Michigan affidavits cited by Trump’s legal team contained claims that were debunked, revealed a lack of understanding of how the counting process works, or did not even purport to describe fraud.” [CNN, [5/6/21](#)]

**Stefanik Would Not Say Trump Was At Fault For January 6**

**STEFANIK CONDEMNED THE VIOLENCE ON JANUARY 6, BUT WOULD NOT SAY TRUMP WAS AT FAULT**

**Stefanik Condemned The Violence On January 6, But Would Not Say Trump Was At Fault.** According to WWNYTV, “North country congresswoman Elise Stefanik condemned Wednesday’s violence in the nation’s capitol, and said she does not blame President Trump for it. “There is no excuse in this nation for any type of violence and while I strongly support the constitutional right to freedom of speech, I absolutely condemn any violent acts, and that’s what we saw in the United States Capitol today,” she told 7 News. But, she said, President Trump did not cause what happened Wednesday, even though President Trump encouraged his followers to come to Washington for Wednesday’s congressional debate over the results of last November’s presidential election. “This is not encouraged,” Stefanik said. “I hope the president and I know the president will forcefully condemn these violent acts today.” [WWNYTV, [1/6/21](#)]

## **STEFANIK REFUSED TO IMPEACH TRUMP FOLLOWING JANUARY 6**

**2021: Stefanik Voted Against Impeaching President Trump For Incitement Of Insurrection After He Repeatedly Claimed Voter Fraud Led To The 2020 Presidential Election Results And Made Statements At A Rally That Encouraged The January 6th Insurrection.** In January 2021, Stefanik voted against a resolution over an article of impeachment which would, according to Congressional Quarterly, “impeach President Donald Trump for incitement of insurrection by ‘inciting violence against the government of the United States.’ Specifically, it would state that Trump ‘repeatedly issued false statements’ asserting that the results of the 2020 presidential election were the product of widespread fraud and should not be accepted or certified. It would state that Trump made statements at a rally on Jan. 6, 2020, that ‘encouraged -- and foreseeably resulted in -- lawless action’ at the Capitol building during the certification of electoral college votes, during which protesters entered the Capitol, attacked law enforcement personnel, ‘menaced’ members of Congress and the vice president, and engaged in other ‘violent, deadly, destructive, and seditious acts.’ It would state that Trump’s conduct on Jan. 6 followed prior efforts ‘to subvert and obstruct’ the certification of 2020 presidential election results, including during a Jan. 2 phone call during which he urged Georgia Secretary of State Brad Raffensperger to ‘find’ enough votes to overturn the state’s presidential election results and ‘threatened Secretary Raffensperger if he failed to do so.’ It would state President Trump’s ‘endangered the security of the United States and its institutions of government’ and that he ‘threatened the integrity of the democratic system, interfered with the peaceful transition of power, and imperiled a coordinate branch of government.’ Pursuant to the rule (H Res 41), upon adoption of the article of impeachment, the House agreed to the resolution (H Res 40) that would appoint and authorize the following impeachment trial managers to conduct the impeachment trial against President Donald Trump in the Senate: Reps. Raskin, D-Md., DeGette, D-Colo., Cicilline, D-R.I., Castro, D-Texas, Swalwell, D-Calif., Lieu, D-Calif., Plaskett, D-V.I., Neguse, D-Colo., and Dean, D-Pa.” The vote was on agreeing to the resolution. The House passed the resolution by a vote of 232-197, but the Senate failed to acquit former President Trump. [House Vote 17, [1/13/21](#); Congressional Quarterly, [1/13/21](#); Congressional Actions, [H.Res. 24](#)]

**Stefanik Called The Push To Impeach Trump “Very Political.”** According to WWNYTV, “Congresswoman Elise Stefanik publicly opposed the push to impeach President Trump Saturday. [...] Our sister station WCAX out of Burlington, Vermont spoke with Stefanik at that rally, and asked if she supports the impeachment of President Trump. Here’s what she said: ‘I oppose the democrats very political push to impeach the President. there are 12 days left before the inauguration. There will be an inauguration and a peaceful transition of power on January 20th. That is the American way,’ said Stefanik.” [WWNYTV, [1/10/21](#)]

## **STEFANIK DEFLECTED BLAME FOR JANUARY 6 TO NANCY PELOSI, CLAIMING SHE FAILED TO ACT AS SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE**

**Stefanik: “The American People Deserve To Know The Truth, That Nancy Pelosi Bears Responsibility As The Speaker Of The House For The Tragedy That Occurred On January 6th.”** According to Syracuse.com, “As Congress began hearings on the Jan. 6 insurrection at the U.S. Capitol, Rep. Elise Stefanik, R-Schuylerville, attempted to deflect blame toward House Speaker Nancy Pelosi. “The American people deserve to know the truth, that Nancy Pelosi bears responsibility as the Speaker of the House for the tragedy that occurred on January 6th,” Stefanik said in a statement Tuesday.” [Syracuse.com, [7/27/21](#)]

**Stefanik Claimed Pelosi Was Aware Of The Potential Security Threat And “Failed To Act.”** According to Syracuse.com, “And it was only after Republicans started asking these questions that she refused to seat them.’ Stefanik, who represents Northern New York’s 21st District, claimed without evidence that Pelosi was ‘aware of potential security threats to the Capitol and she failed to act.’” [Syracuse.com, [7/27/21](#)]

## **Fact-Checkers Pointed Out That The Capitol Police Board, Not Pelosi, Could Decide Whether To Call In The National Guard**

**Fact-Checkers Pointed Out That The Capitol Police Board, Not Pelosi, Could Decide Whether To Call In The National Guard.** According to Syracuse.com, “The Associated Press fact-checkers point out that the Capitol Police Board, not Pelosi, decides whether or not to call National Guard troops to the Capitol.” [Syracuse.com, [7/27/21](#)]

## **STEFANIK INTRODUCED A RESOLUTION STATING THAT TRUMP “DID NOT ENGAGE IN AN INSURRECTION”**

**Gaetz Introduced A Resolution Stating That Trump “Did Not Engage In An Insurrection Or Rebellion Against The United States.”** According to the New York Post, “Firebrand Rep. Matt Gaetz and at least 65 House Republicans rolled out a resolution Tuesday stating that former President Donald Trump ‘did not engage in insurrection or rebellion against the United States.’ The one-page resolution attempts to undercut justification to jettison Trump off state ballots across the country. This comes as the Supreme Court is poised to hear oral arguments on the Colorado matter on Thursday. ‘We are here today to authoritatively express that President Trump did not commit an insurrection and we believe Congress has a unique role in making that declaration,’ Gaetz (R-Fla.) explained at a press conference. ‘It’s time for members of the House and Senate to show where they stand on this question.’” [New York Post, [2/6/24](#)]

**Stefanik Said She Was “Honored” To Cosponsor The Resolution With Gaetz.** According to Stefanik’s Twitter, “I am honored to stand as an original cosponsor on @RepMattGaetz’s resolution that President Donald Trump did not engage in insurrection or rebellion against the United States. That is a fact. Rogue Democrat operatives are attempting to use this lie to illegally take President Trump off the ballot.” [Twitter, @RepEliseStefanik, [2/6/24](#)]

## **Stefanik Echoed Trump’s Sympathies For The January 6 Rioters**

### **STEFANIK CALLED JANUARY 6 RIOTERS “HOSTAGES,” ECHOING TRUMP**

**Stefanik Called January 6 Rioters “Hostages.”** According to CNN, “GOP Rep. Elise Stefanik on Sunday echoed Republican presidential front-runner Donald Trump as she referred to those sentenced to prison for their roles in the January 6, 2021, attack on the US Capitol as ‘hostages.’ ‘I have concerns about the treatment of January 6 hostages. I have concerns, we have a role in Congress of oversight over our treatment of prisoners, and I believe we’re seeing the weaponization of the federal government against not just President Trump, but we’re seeing it against conservatives,’ the New York Republican said on NBC’s ‘Meet the Press.’” [CNN, [1/7/24](#)]

**November 2023: Trump Called Those Arrested For Attacking The Capitol On January 6 “Hostages.”** According to The Hill, “Former President Trump on Thursday referred to those jailed over their actions during the Jan. 6, 2021, riot at the Capitol as ‘hostages’ during a rally with supporters in Texas. Trump walked on stage at a Houston rally to Lee Greenwood’s ‘God Bless the USA’ as he typically does. But when it concluded, a song in which Trump collaborated with a chorus of inmates detained on charges related to the Jan. 6 insurrection began to play, and the former president stood saluting. ‘Well, thank you very much, and you know what that was,’ he said to open the rally. ‘I call them the ‘J-6 hostages,’ not prisoners. I call them the hostages, what’s happened. And you know, it’s a shame.’” [The Hill, [11/2/23](#)]

## **Stefanik Would Not Commit To Certifying The 2024 Presidential Election Results**

### **STEFANIK WOULD NOT COMMIT TO CERTIFYING THE 2024 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION RESULTS**

**Stefanik Would Not Commit To Certifying The 2024 Presidential Election Results.** According to NBC News, “Rep. Elise Stefanik, R-N.Y., on Sunday wouldn’t commit to certifying the 2024 election results during an interview on NBC News’ ‘Meet the Press.’ While interviewing Stefanik, who serves in House Republican leadership, host Kristen Welker asked, ‘Would you vote to certify, and will you vote to certify, the results of the 2024 election no matter what they show?’ Stefanik, who has boosted former President Donald Trump’s baseless claims of widespread fraud in the 2020 election, said that she did not vote to certify the 2020 results in the state of Pennsylvania and several other states because there were ‘unconstitutional acts circumventing the state legislature and unilaterally changing election law.’” [NBC News, [1/7/24](#)]

## STEFANIK SAID SHE WOULD NOT HAVE CERTIFIED THE 2020 ELECTION RESULTS

### Stefanik Said She Would Not Have Certified The 2020 Election Results, Said “I Would Not Have Done What Mike Pence Did. I Don’t Think That Was The Right Approach”

**Stefanik Said She Would Not Have Certified The 2020 Election Results, Said “I Would Not Have Done What Mike Pence Did. I Don’t Think That Was The Right Approach.”** According to the Hill, “House Republican Conference Chair Elise Stefanik (R-N.Y.) said that she would not have allowed 2020 election results to be certified on Jan. 6, 2021 if she was in former Vice President Mike Pence’s position. ‘I would not have done what Mike Pence did. I don’t think that was the right approach,’ Stefanik said on CNN Thursday evening. ‘I specifically stand by what I said on the House floor.’” [The Hill, [2/9/24](#)]

**Stefanik Explained Her Reasoning For Not Certifying Pennsylvania’s 2020 Election Results, Claimed There Was “Unconstitutional Overreach” In Pennsylvania.** According to the Hill, “‘There was unconstitutional overreach in states like Pennsylvania, and I think it’s very important that we continue to stand up for the Constitution and have legal and secure elections, which we did not have in 2020,’ Stefanik said.” [The Hill, [2/9/24](#)]

**Stefanik Claimed Pennsylvania’s Election Results Were “Unconstitutional When There Was Circumventing State Legislatures, Unilaterally Changing Election Law.”** According to the Hill, “CNN host Kaitlan Collins pushed back with a reference to a different case, saying the Pennsylvania Supreme Court had rejected another Republican-led case that challenged mail-in voting itself as unconstitutional – a mail-in voting law that was approved under a Republican-controlled state legislature. ‘It was unconstitutional when there was circumventing state legislatures, unilaterally changing election law,’ Stefanik said.” [The Hill, [2/9/24](#)]

### Stefanik Received Criticism For Her Comments That She Would Not Have Certified The 2020 Election Results

*Rep. Dan Crenshaw Said Stefanik’s Remarks Were “Completely Incorrect”*

**Rep. Dan Crenshaw Said Stefanik’s Remarks Were “Completely Incorrect,” Argued The Office Of The Vice Presidency Does Not Have The Authority To Decertify An Election.** According to the Washington Times, “Rep. Dan Crenshaw balked at House Republican Conference Chairwoman Elise Stefanik’s claim that she would have decertified the 2020 election had she been vice president at the time, calling the assertion ‘completely incorrect.’ Mr. Crenshaw, Texas Republican, argued that the office of the vice president does not even have the constitutional authority to decertify an election. ‘The only reason I’m not worried is because what she’s saying is so completely incorrect,’ Mr. Crenshaw told CNN on Friday. ‘The Constitution gives you no power — you, being the vice president — gives you no power to decertify the election. It’s very clear.’” [Washington Times, [2/10/24](#)]

*Former Vice President Counsel Gregory Jacob Raised Concerns With Stefanik’s Comments Against Certifying The 2020 Election Results*

**Former Vice President Counsel Gregory Jacob Raised Concerns With Stefanik’s Comments Against Certifying The 2020 Election Results.** According to Gregory Jacob’s via the Wall Street Journal, “The auditions to be Donald Trump’s running mate have begun, and aspirants are practicing and delivering their lines. On Thursday Rep. Elise Stefanik said that if she had been vice president on Jan. 6, 2021, “I would not have done what Mike Pence did.” She wouldn’t have opened the certificates and counted the electoral votes as the Constitution expressly requires. [...] Ms. Stefanik evidently has concluded it is in her interest to say what Mr. Trump wants to hear. My fellow Republicans should recognize it is neither consistent with our character nor in our interest to embrace this view. It amounts to a suicide pact.” [Wall Street Journal, Opinion – Gregory F. Jacob, [2/11/24](#)]

**Jacob Noted That Stefanik Worked For Him During The George Bush Administration**

**Jacob Noted That Stefanik Worked For Him During The George Bush Administration.** According to Gregory Jacob’s via the Wall Street Journal, “Ms. Stefanik worked for me in 2006-07 as executive assistant for the Domestic Policy Council in George W. Bush’s White House. When she first ran for Congress, in 2014, she was a thoughtful, principled conservative determined to champion the interests of her left-behind upstate New York district. I enthusiastically contributed to her campaign.” [Wall Street Journal, Opinion – Gregory F. Jacob, [2/11/24](#)]

**Jacob Contributed To Stefanik's Campaign For House.** According to Gregory Jacob's via the Wall Street Journal, "Ms. Stefanik worked for me in 2006-07 as executive assistant for the Domestic Policy Council in George W. Bush's White House. When she first ran for Congress, in 2014, she was a thoughtful, principled conservative determined to champion the interests of her left-behind upstate New York district. I enthusiastically contributed to her campaign." [Wall Street Journal, Opinion – Gregory F. Jacob, [2/11/24](#)]

## **Stefanik Voted Against The Freedom To Vote Act, An Omnibus Bill To Strengthen Elections And Democracy**

### **STEFANIK VOTED THE FREEDOM TO VOTE ACT**

**Stefanik Voted Against The Freedom To Vote Act.** In January 2022, according to Congressional Quarterly, Stefanik voted against concurring in the Senate amendment with a House amendment to the Freedom to Vote: John R. Lewis Act, which in part would "expand disclosure requirements for large campaign contributions, require candidates and political committees to report foreign contacts to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and prohibit the creation of corporations to conceal foreign election contributions." The vote was on a motion to concur. The House agreed to the motion by a vote of 220-203, thus the bill was sent to the Senate. The Senate subsequently failed to invoke cloture. [House Vote 9, [1/13/22](#); Congressional Quarterly, [1/13/22](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 5746](#)]

### **THE FREEDOM TO VOTE ACT WOULD HAVE ENACTED STRONGER CAMPAIGN FINANCE GUIDELINES**

#### **The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Regulated Campaign Finance By Limiting Dark Money By Political Action Committees And Requiring Groups That Spend Over \$10,000 To Disclose Their Donors**

**The Freedom To Vote Act Would Regulate Campaign Finance By Limiting Dark Money By Political Action Committees And Requiring Groups That Spend Over \$10,000 To Disclose Their Donors.** According to NPR, "It would also impose new rules on how campaigns are paid for by limiting the use of so-called dark money by political action committees. Any group that spends more than \$10,000 to influence an election would be required to disclose all donors." [NPR, [1/18/22](#)]

#### **The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Required Additional Campaign Finance Disclosures**

**The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Required Additional Campaign Finance Disclosures.** According to Congressional Quarterly, "The bill also includes provisions that would require more disclosures of political money. It would toughen prohibitions on foreign nationals' spending on elections, including on ballot initiatives, and would require additional disclosures of the sources of money for groups that spend to influence elections." [Congressional Quarterly, [1/13/22](#)]

#### **The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Required Additional Disclosures On Money Sources For Political Groups Spending To Influence Elections**

**The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Required Additional Disclosures On Money Sources For Political Groups That Spend To Influence Elections.** According to Congressional Quarterly, "The bill also includes provisions that would require more disclosures of political money. It would toughen prohibitions on foreign nationals' spending on elections, including on ballot initiatives, and would require additional disclosures of the sources of money for groups that spend to influence elections." [Congressional Quarterly, [1/13/22](#)]

### **THE FREEDOM TO VOTE ACT WOULD HAVE EMPOWERED WATCHDOGS TO CRACK DOWN ON ABUSING THE LAW WHILE CAMPAIGNING**

#### **The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Fortified The Federal Election Commission's Authority To Investigate Campaign Abuse Charges**



**The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Fortified The Federal Election Commission’s Authority To Investigate Campaign Abuse Charges.** According to NPR, “The measure would also strengthen the Federal Election Commission’s ability to investigate charges of campaign abuses and require that states replace outdated voting machines with ones that, among other things, provide voters with paper records of their ballots.” [NPR, [1/18/22](#)]

### **The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Strengthened Prohibitions On Foreign Spending In Elections**

**The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Strengthened Prohibitions On Foreign Spending On Elections, Including Ballot Initiatives.** According to Congressional Quarterly, “The bill also includes provisions that would require more disclosures of political money. It would toughen prohibitions on foreign nationals’ spending on elections, including on ballot initiatives, and would require additional disclosures of the sources of money for groups that spend to influence elections.” [Congressional Quarterly, [1/13/22](#)]

### **THE FREEDOM TO VOTE ACT WOULD HAVE STRENGTHENED VOTING EQUIPMENT**

**The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Required The Replacement Of Outdated Voting Machines With Machines That Provide Voters Paper Receipts Of Their Ballots.** According to NPR, “The measure would also strengthen the Federal Election Commission’s ability to investigate charges of campaign abuses and require that states replace outdated voting machines with ones that, among other things, provide voters with paper records of their ballots.” [NPR, [1/18/22](#)]

### **THE FREEDOM TO VOTE ACT WOULD HAVE MADE IT EASIER TO VOTE**

#### **The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Made Election Day A National Holiday**

**The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Made Election Day A National Holiday.** According to NPR, “The measure would: make Election Day a national holiday, aimed at making easier for all voters to get to the polls that day; allow states to have early voting for at least two weeks prior to Election Day, including nights and weekends; allow voting by mail with no excuses needed, and voters could put their ballots in drop boxes; require that states make voting more accessible for people with disabilities; require that states that require IDs for voting would have to broaden the types of identification acceptable. States would also have to offer same-day voting registration and online registration and also make it easier to register at places like departments of motor vehicles.” [NPR, [1/18/22](#)]

#### **The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Allowed States To Have At Least Two Weeks Of Early Voting**

**The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Permitted States To Have At Least Two Weeks Of Early Voting.** According to NPR, “The measure would: make Election Day a national holiday, aimed at making easier for all voters to get to the polls that day; allow states to have early voting for at least two weeks prior to Election Day, including nights and weekends; allow voting by mail with no excuses needed, and voters could put their ballots in drop boxes; require that states make voting more accessible for people with disabilities; require that states that require IDs for voting would have to broaden the types of identification acceptable. States would also have to offer same-day voting registration and online registration and also make it easier to register at places like departments of motor vehicles.” [NPR, [1/18/22](#)]

#### **The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Allowed No-Excuse Absentee Ballot Voting**

**The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Allowed No-Excuse Absentee Ballot Voting.** According to NPR, “The measure would: make Election Day a national holiday, aimed at making easier for all voters to get to the polls that day; allow states to have early voting for at least two weeks prior to Election Day, including nights and weekends; allow voting by mail with no excuses needed, and voters could put their ballots in drop boxes; require that states make voting more accessible for people with disabilities; require that states that require IDs for voting would have to broaden the types of identification acceptable. States would also have to offer same-day voting registration and online registration and also make it easier to register at places like departments of motor vehicles.” [NPR, [1/18/22](#)]

#### **The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Made It Easier For People With Disabilities To Access The Ballot**

**The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Required Greater Accessibility For People With Disabilities.** According to NPR, “The measure would: make Election Day a national holiday, aimed at making easier for all voters to get to the polls that day; allow states to have early voting for at least two weeks prior to Election Day, including nights and weekends; allow voting

by mail with no excuses needed, and voters could put their ballots in drop boxes; require that states make voting more accessible for people with disabilities; require that states that require IDs for voting would have to broaden the types of identification acceptable. States would also have to offer same-day voting registration and online registration and also make it easier to register at places like departments of motor vehicles.” [NPR, [1/18/22](#)]

### **The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Required States To Broaden Their Valid Photo ID Requirements**

**The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Required States To Broaden Their Valid Photo Identification Requirements.** According to NPR, “The measure would: make Election Day a national holiday, aimed at making easier for all voters to get to the polls that day; allow states to have early voting for at least two weeks prior to Election Day, including nights and weekends; allow voting by mail with no excuses needed, and voters could put their ballots in drop boxes; require that states make voting more accessible for people with disabilities; require that states that require IDs for voting would have to broaden the types of identification acceptable. States would also have to offer same-day voting registration and online registration and also make it easier to register at places like departments of motor vehicles.” [NPR, [1/18/22](#)]

### **The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Required States To Offer Same-Day And Online Voter Registration**

**The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Required States To Offer Same-Day And Online Voter Registration.** According to NPR, “The measure would: make Election Day a national holiday, aimed at making easier for all voters to get to the polls that day; allow states to have early voting for at least two weeks prior to Election Day, including nights and weekends; allow voting by mail with no excuses needed, and voters could put their ballots in drop boxes; require that states make voting more accessible for people with disabilities; require that states that require IDs for voting would have to broaden the types of identification acceptable. States would also have to offer same-day voting registration and online registration and also make it easier to register at places like departments of motor vehicles.” [NPR, [1/18/22](#)]

### **The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Limited How States Could Conduct Voter Purges**

**The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Limited How States May Conduct Voter Purges From Voter Checklists.** According to NPR, “The measure would also outlaw partisan gerrymandering — that is, drawing congressional boundaries to the political advantage of one party or another — and would limit the ways states can purge people from voting rolls.” [NPR, [1/18/22](#)]

### **The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Protected Voters From Intimidation Efforts**

**The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Prohibited Intimidating Individuals From Registering To Vote, Engaging In Voter Intimidation And Harassment Of Election Workers, And Restricting Food And Non-Alcoholic Drinks At Polling Locations.** According to Congressional Quarterly, the Freedom to Vote: John R. Lewis Act, would “prohibit any attempt to prevent an individual from registering to vote, prohibit certain practices related to voter intimidation and harassment of election workers, and prohibit states from restricting the provision of food and nonalcoholic beverages at polling locations.” The vote was on a motion to concur. The House agreed to the motion by a vote of 220-203, thus the bill was sent to the Senate. The Senate subsequently failed to invoke cloture. [House Vote 9, [1/13/22](#); Congressional Quarterly, [1/13/22](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 5746](#)]

### **THE FREEDOM TO VOTE ACT WOULD HAVE STRENGTHENED ANTI-DISCRIMINATION ENFORCEMENT UNDER THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT**

**The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Strengthened Anti-Discrimination Enforcement By Restoring Preclearance Requirements Under The Voting Rights Act.** According to Congressional Quarterly, “Among other provisions to strengthen anti-discrimination enforcement authorities in relation to voting practices, the bill would effectively restore preclearance requirements under the Voting Rights Act for any changes to voting practices in states and localities with a history of voting rights violations in the previous 25 years. It would establish formulas to identify such jurisdictions, which would be required to submit proposed changes to the Justice Department for preclearance before implementation.” The vote was on a motion to concur. The House agreed to the motion by a vote of 220-203, thus the bill was sent to the Senate. The Senate subsequently failed to invoke cloture. [House Vote 9, [1/13/22](#); Congressional Quarterly, [1/13/22](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 5746](#)]

### **THE FREEDOM TO VOTE ACT WOULD HAVE PROTECTED THE RIGHT TO VOTE**

**The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Required States To Have A Specific Governmental Interest For Implementing Election Changes That Could Substantially Affect Voting Rights.** According to Congressional Quarterly, “The new language would require states to have an important and specific government interest if they want to implement election changes that would substantially impair the right to vote or have the vote be counted. And those election changes would have to be the least restrictive way of accomplishing that interest.” [Congressional Quarterly, [1/13/22](#)]

## **THE FREEDOM TO VOTE ACT WOULD HAVE MADE ELECTIONS AND DEMOCRACY FAIRER**

### **The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Prohibited Partisan Gerrymandering**

**The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Prohibited Partisan Gerrymandering.** According to NPR, “The measure would also outlaw partisan gerrymandering — that is, drawing congressional boundaries to the political advantage of one party or another — and would limit the ways states can purge people from voting rolls.” [NPR, [1/18/22](#)]

### **The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Established A Small Donor Matching System For Some Candidates**

**The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Established A Small Donor Matching System For House Candidates, In Which The Election Assistance And Innovation Fund Would Match Contributions Up To \$200 At A Six-To-One Ratio.** According to NPR, “A small donor matching system would be set up for House candidates. A new Election Assistance and Innovation Fund would match contributions up to \$200 at a 6:1 ratio. The fund would not use taxpayer dollars and instead be financed through assessments paid on fines, penalties and settlements for certain tax crimes and corporate malfeasance.” [NPR, [1/18/22](#)]

### **The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Required States And Localities To Provide Public Notices Of Voting Procedure Changes**

**The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Required States And Localities To Provide Public Notice Of Voting Procedure Changes Within 180 Days Of A Federal Election.** According to Congressional Quarterly, the Freedom to Vote: John R. Lewis Act, would “require states and localities to provide public notice regarding any changes to voting procedures made within 180 days of a federal election, and regarding updated demographic data following any electoral district boundary changes.” The vote was on a motion to concur. The House agreed to the motion by a vote of 220-203, thus the bill was sent to the Senate. The Senate subsequently failed to invoke cloture. [House Vote 9, [1/13/22](#); Congressional Quarterly, [1/13/22](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 5746](#)]

## **Stefanik Voted Against Efforts To Expand Voting Rights And Make Ballot Access Easier**

### **STEFANIK VOTED AGAINST AN AMENDMENT THAT WOULD REQUIRE A STUDY OF THE 2020 ELECTIONS TO IMPROVE STATE VOTE-BY-MAIL SYSTEMS**

**2021: Stefanik Voted Against An Amendment That Would Require A Study On The 2020 Elections And Recommendations To Support States Improve Their Vote-By-Mail Systems.** In March 2021, Stefanik voted against en block amendments no. 1 to the For The People Act which would, according to Congressional Quarterly, “require the Election Assistance Commission to conduct a study on the 2020 elections and compile a list of recommendations to help states transition to or improve their current vote-by-mail system.” The vote was on adoption of amendments. The House adopted the amendments by a vote of 218-210. [House Vote 52, [3/2/21](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/2/21](#); Congressional Actions, [H.Amdt. 16](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 1](#)]

### **STEFANIK VOTED AGAINST MAKING ELECTION DAY A FEDERAL HOLIDAY**

**2019: Stefanik Voted Against Making Election Day A Federal Holiday As Part Of A Larger Anti-Corruption And Democracy Reform Bill.** In March 2019, Stefanik voted against The “For The People Act.” According to Congressional Quarterly, “The bill includes numerous provisions intended to make it easier for Americans to register and vote in federal

elections — including by making the general election day in November a federal holiday and expressing the sense of Congress that private employers should also give their employees that day off so they can vote.” The overall was, also according to CBS News, “the most sweeping anti-corruption measure passed by the House of Representatives in a generation, by a vote of 234 to 193. The bill focuses on voting rights, campaign finance, and government ethics.” The vote was on passage. The House passed the bill by a vote of 234 to 193. [House Vote 118, [3/8/19](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/5/19](#); CBS News, [3/8/19](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 1](#)]

## **STEFANIK VOTED AGAINST AN AMENDMENT THAT WOULD REQUIRE CERTAIN POLLING LOCATIONS TO STAY OPEN FOR AN EXTENDED FOUR HOURS**

**2021: Stefanik Voted Against An Amendment That Would Require Certain Polling Locations To Stay Open For An Extended Four Hours Outside The Typical Working Hours Of 9 AM To 5 PM.** In March 2021, Stefanik voted against en bloc amendments no.4 to the For The People Act which would, according to Congressional Quarterly, “require states to run polling locations that are open for at least four hours outside of the period between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.” The vote was on adoption of amendments. The House adopted the amendments by a vote of 223-208. [House Vote 58, [3/3/21](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/3/21](#); Congressional Actions, [H.Amdt. 23](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 1](#)]

## **STEFANIK VOTED AGAINST REQUIRING CONTINGENCY PLANS TO ALLOW VOTING DURING A STATE OF EMERGENCY**

**2021: Stefanik Voted Against Requiring Contingency Plans To Allow Voting During A State Of Emergency, Including A Natural Disaster Or Pandemic.** In March 2021, Stefanik voted against the For The People Act which would, according to Congressional Quarterly, “require states to establish contingency plans to enable voting during an emergency, including a natural disaster or infectious disease.” The vote was on passage. The House passed the bill by a vote of 220-210. The Senate did not take substantive action on the bill. [House Vote 62, [3/3/21](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/3/21](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 1](#)]

## **STEFANIK VOTED AGAINST AN AMENDMENT THAT WOULD REQUIRE ELECTION OFFICIALS TO CONSIDER LINGUISTIC PREFERENCES WHEN POSTING POLLING LOCATION NOTICES**

**2021: Stefanik Voted Against An Amendment That Would Require Election Officials To Consider Linguistic Preferences When Posting Polling Location Notices.** In March 2021, Stefanik voted against en bloc amendments no.3 to the For The People Act which would, according to Congressional Quarterly, “require election officials to take the linguistic preferences of voters in the jurisdiction into account when posting required notices at polling locations.” The vote was on adoption of amendments. The House adopted the amendments by a vote of 221-207. [House Vote 55, [3/2/21](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/2/21](#); Congressional Actions, [H.Amdt. 20](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 1](#)]

## **STEFANIK VOTED AGAINST AN AMENDMENT THAT WOULD ALLOW COLLEGE CAMPUSES TO SERVE AS POLLING LOCATIONS**

**2021: Stefanik Voted Against An Amendment That Would Allow College Campuses To Serve As Polling Locations.** In March 2021, Stefanik voted against en block amendments no. 1 to the For The People Act which would, according to Congressional Quarterly, “require states to ensure that polling places that allow early voting be located on campuses of higher education institutions.” The vote was on adoption of amendments. The House adopted the amendments by a vote of 218-210. [House Vote 52, [3/2/21](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/2/21](#); Congressional Actions, [H.Amdt. 16](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 1](#)]

## **Stefanik Voted Against Efforts To Strengthen Elections From Cybersecurity And Foreign Threats**

### **STEFANIK VOTED TWICE AGAINST ASSESSING CYBER THREATS BEFORE ANY ELECTION**

**2021: Stefanik Voted Against Assessing Cyber Threats Before Any Election.** In March 2021, Stefanik voted against the For The People Act which would, according to Congressional Quarterly, “require the Homeland Security Department to

assess cyber threats to the election system prior to any election.” The vote was on passage. The House passed the bill by a vote of 220-210. The Senate did not take substantive action on the bill. [House Vote 62, [3/3/21](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/3/21](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 1](#)]

**2021: Stefanik Voted Against An Amendment That Would Appoint A Senior Cyber Policy Advisor To Be The Primary Policy Advisor To The Election Assistance Commission On Cybersecurity For National Elections.** In March 2021, Stefanik voted against en bloc amendments no.3 to the For The People Act which would, according to Congressional Quarterly, “direct the Election Assistance Commission to appoint a senior cyber policy advisor to be the primary policy advisor to the commission on cybersecurity matters for federal elections.” The vote was on adoption of amendments. The House adopted the amendments by a vote of 221-207. [House Vote 55, [3/2/21](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/2/21](#); Congressional Actions, [H.Amdt. 20](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 1](#)]

## **STEFANIK VOTED FOR AN AMENDMENT THAT WOULD STRIKE A PROVISION THAT WOULD PROTECT U.S. DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS FROM CYBER ATTACKS, DISINFORMATION, AND INFLUENCE OPERATIONS**

**2021: Stefanik Voted For An Amendment That Would Strike A Provision That Would Protect U.S. Democratic Institutions From Activities That Undermine Integrity Such As Cyber Attacks, Disinformation, And Influence Operations.** In March 2021, Stefanik voted for an amendment to For The People Act which would, according to Congressional Quarterly, “strike from the bill a section that would require the creation of a national strategy to protect against cyber attacks, influence operations, disinformation campaigns and other activities that could undermine the security and integrity of U.S. democratic institutions, and that would establish a commission to counter efforts to undermine democratic institutions within the United States.” The vote was on adoption of an amendment. The House rejected the amendment by a vote of 207-218. [House Vote 54, [3/2/21](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/2/21](#); Congressional Actions, [H.Amdt. 19](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 1](#)]

## **STEFANIK VOTED AGAINST AN ELECTION SECURITY BILL TO COUNTER FOREIGN INTERFERENCE IN AMERICAN ELECTIONS**

**2019: Stefanik Voted Against An Election Security Bill To Counter Foreign Interference In American Elections.** In October 2019, Stefanik voted against a bill that would, according to Congressional Quarterly, “expand disclosure requirements for political advertisements and prohibit certain activities related to political campaigns, particularly with regards to foreign influence. Specifically, the bill would require political campaign committees to report foreign contacts by the campaign to the Federal Election Commission and Federal Bureau of Investigation, within one week of the contact. It would require such disclosures in the case of any direct or indirect foreign communication between the candidate or campaign officials and foreign nationals that involves any offer or proposal for a contribution or provision of services between the two entities. It would require candidates and campaign officials to notify their campaign committees within three days of such contact. It would establish criminal penalties for violations of these disclosure requirements, including fines of up to \$500,000 or a prison term of up to five years. The bill would expand certain existing FEC regulations for political advertising to include internet communications, including to require paid advertisement disclaimers and prohibit spending by foreign nationals for online and digital political ads. Among other provisions, it would also establish criminal penalties for any attempts to hinder, interfere with, or prevent a person from voting or registering to vote, and it would require reports to Congress within 180 days of each federal election detailing reports of deceptive practices and evaluating the influence of foreign financing in U.S. elections.” The vote was on passage. The House passed the bill by a vote of 227-181. The bill was never taken up in the Senate. [House Vote 583, [10/23/19](#); Congressional Quarterly, [10/23/19](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R.4617](#)]

**2019: Stefanik Voted Against An Election Security Bill Related To Voting System Infrastructure.** In June 2019, Stefanik voted against a bill that would, according to Congressional Quarterly, “authorize funding for and establish a number of requirements related to voting system infrastructure, security, and audits for federal elections. Specifically, it would require each jurisdiction administering voting for a federal election to conduct votes with paper ballots that can be counted either by hand or optical scanner and to conduct manual audits for all federal elections before an election is certified. It would authorize \$1.3 billion through fiscal 2026 for U.S. Election Assistance Commission grants for states to update voting systems in accordance with the bill's provisions, including for cybersecurity risk mitigation and to conduct post-election audits. Among other provisions, it would require states to use voting system hardware and software manufactured in the U.S., require that such systems are tested by the Commission at least nine months before a general federal election, and establish certain disclosure and cybersecurity incident reporting requirements for vendors of voting system equipment. It would also prohibit states from

using voting systems connected to the internet or containing wireless capabilities and would require jurisdictions to ensure that each polling station has voting systems equipped for individuals with disabilities, including visual and mobility disabilities.” The vote was on passage. The House passed the bill by a vote of 225-184. The bill was never taken up in the Senate. [House Vote 428, [6/27/19](#); Congressional Quarterly, [6/27/19](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R.2722](#)]

### **The Election Security Bill Would Have Criminalized The Sharing Of Nonpublic Information Between Campaigns And Foreign Nationals**

**The Election Security Bill Would Have Criminalized The Sharing Of Nonpublic Information Between Campaigns And Foreign Nationals.** According to Congressional Quarterly, “House Democrats passed more legislation Wednesday meant to counter foreign interference in American elections [...] The legislation would require campaigns to report offers of foreign assistance to the FBI, restrict foreign nationals from the decision-making process of political action committees and establish disclosure rules to keep foreign nationals from funding online advertisements about candidates, elections and national legislative issues, among other provisions [...] The bill would also make it a crime for candidates or their campaigns to give a foreign national nonpublic information related to an American election.” [Congressional Quarterly, [10/23/19](#)]

### **The Election Security Bill Would Have Required Voting Systems To Use Backup Paper Ballots In Federal Elections**

**The Election Security Bill Would Have Required Voting Systems To Use Backup Paper Ballots In Federal Elections.** According to Congressional Quarterly, “The house passed an election security measure Thursday that would require voting systems to use backup paper ballots in federal contests, while also mandating improvements to the higher-tech side of politics [...] It would also require implementation of cybersecurity safeguards for hardware and software used in elections, bar the use of wireless communication devices in election systems and require that electronic voting machines be manufactured in the United States.” [Congressional Quarterly, [6/27/19](#)]